THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE ALBERTA SECONDARY EDUCATION POLICY, 1986

BY

BEVERLEY LYNN BOSETTI

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTERS OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1986

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-32340-X

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: BEVERLEY LYNN BOSETTI

TITLE OF THESIS: THE ALBERTA SECONDARY EDUCATION POLCIY 1985

DEGREE: MASTERS OF EDUCATION

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1986

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Student's signature)

55 BELLEVUE CRESCENT

ST. ALBERT, ALBERTA

T8N 0A5

(Student's permanent address)

Date: October 8, 1986

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled THE ALBERTA SECONDARY EDUCATION POLICY, 1986 submitted by BEVERLEY LYNN BOSETTI in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF EDUCATION in Educational Administration.

Supervisor

Date: October 8, 1986

Dedicated
to
Anne, Rino, and Italo Bosetti

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain the pattern of events that led to the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy (June, 1985) in terms of six theoretical frameworks. Achieving a comprehensive understanding of the policymaking process adopted often depends on the ablity of the policy analyst to see how different aspects of the policy formulation process may coexist in a complementary or even paradoxical way. Consequently, models of policymaking were abstracted from the literature and used to analyze the public policymaking process. Each model provided a particular focus, and enhanced understanding of different dimensions of the policy formulation process.

The case study methodology was adopted to carry the study through two stages. The first stage consisted of the development of a chronology of the policy formulation process from the time period February, 1984 to June, 1985; the second stage consisted of the analysis of the policy formulation process. The analysis focused on the involvement of the six key stakeholder groups, and the degree to which the policy formulation process reflected elements of the six theoretical models. Primary source documents, as well as semi-structured interviews were used to assist the researcher in the collection and consequent analysis of the data.

The findings concluded that while provincial legislation determines the path of education by virtue of the fact that it represents the formal policymaking mechanism, this path is shaped through the influences exerted by major stakeholding and interest groups. The formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy benefited from a deliberate, and consciously planned approach to the formulation of the policy whereby explicit mechanisms were established with the expressed purpose of soliciting input from

individual and stakeholding groups in a controlled and efficient manner. Through this consultative process the government was able to assess probable effects of adopting certain policy alternatives, determine outside support for the policy, facilitate group input, and promote represetation of disadvantaged groups that may ordinarily have not become involved in the policymaking process. While the consultative process adopted in the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy demonstrated some limitations and some strengths, it provides the basis for further research into the effective involvement of individual and stakeholding groups in public policymaking, as well as the effect the consultative approach adopted in this policy will have on its adoption and implementation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowlege with sincere appreciation those individuals that assisted in the completion of this study. The advice, encouragement, and insights provided by her supervisor, Dr. D. A. MacKay, was invaluable. The thought provoking questions offered by the members of her examining committee, Dr. J. E. Seger, Dr. D. A. MacKay, and Dr. D. Wangler, were especially appreciated.

Appreciation and recognition is also expressed to the personnel of Alberta Education whose assistance, encouragement, and insights made the completion of this study possible.

Finally, to her parents, Anne and Rino, and her family, Shelley, Terry, Matthew, Bruce and Italo, whose endless encouragement, patience, understanding, and assistance, was sincerely, and graciously appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose of the study	1
	Significance of the study	2
	Significance of the Secondary Education Policy	3
	Research questions	4
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
	Utility of selected models	7
	Systems theory	9
	Group theory	12
	Elite theory	15
	Rational model	18
	Institutional model	21
	Toward a conceptual framework	23
	Megapolicy	26
	Metapolicy	27
	A systems framework for analysis of the Secondary Education Policy	28
	Framework	29
	Social system	32
	Values	32
	Goals and needs	33
	Attainments	34
	Discrepancies	35

Inputs 35
Demands 35
Supports 36
The conversion process 37
Summary and conclusions 37
III. RESEARCH PROCEDURES 39
Methodological issues 39
Reliability 40
Investigator bais 40
Question bias 40
Retrospective bias 41
Case study approach 41
Data collection 43
Interviews 44
Data analysis 46
Summary 46
IV. THE POLICY FORMULATION PROCESS 47
Overview of the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy 47
Assessing need for change 48
Preliminary investigation and testing of values 49
The Secondary Education review process 50
Secondary Education in Alberta Policy Statement 57
Implications of Policy Statement for Instructional Program of Studies 60
Summary 64

V. PARTICIPATION OF MAJOR STAKEHOLDING GROUPS 65

Minister's Advisory Committee 66

Alberta Teachers' Association 70

Alberta School Trustees' Association 74

Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Association 77

Conference for Alberta School Superintendents 78

Association of Independent Schools and Colleges in Alberta 80

Summary and Conclusions 83

VI. THE POLICY FORMULATION PROCESS IN TERMS OF SIX THEORETICAL MODELS 88

Systems Theory 88

Group Theory 93

Elite Theory 99

Institutional Theory 103

Rational Model 104

Integrated Systems Model 107

Conclusion 112

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 113

Outline of study 114

Stage one: Chronology of events 115

Stage two: Analysis 115

Research Questions 116

Implications and conclusions 127

BIBLIOGRAPHY 132

APPENDIX A: CHRONOLOGY 139

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE 145

APPENDIX C: CORRESPONDENCE 152

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
I	Categories of Relevant Political Data	24
II	Political Dimensions of the Consultative Process Employed in the Secondary Education Review	57

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	The Systems Model	11
2.	Group Theory Model	14
3.	Elite Theory Model	17
4.	Rational Model	20
5.	Integrated Systems Model	30
6.	Metapolicy Making	31

Chapter 1

Introduction

The responsibility for the organization and administration of education in Canada was assigned to the provinces by Section 93 of the British North America Act. Consequently, the educational authority of each province is all powerful, and the provincial legislature reserves the right to determine the path that education is to follow. However, although the provincial legislature determines the path of education by virtue of the fact that it represents the formal policymaking mechanism, that path is often shaped through the influences exerted by major stakeholding and interest groups. Thus, legislative decision is often the result of intensive negotiation, bargaining, and compromising with major stakeholding groups, each attempting to exert influence over the shape of the final policy statement. Kimbrough states...

> The process of decision-making...appears to come about throught an interplay between those holding the offical power and those representing the plurality of organizedgoal setting groups. This process seems to be not unlike the market place where the plurality of forces, both official and unofficial, bargains for policy decisions (Kimbrough, 1964:15).

THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to describe and to explain the pattern of events that led to the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy (June, 1985) in terms of six

theoretical frameworks that have been developed to enhance our understanding of the policy formulation process.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Dye (1981:5-6) identifies three reasons for studying the formulation of public policy: scientific, professional, and political reasons. First, Dye(1981:5) suggests that the examination and analysis of the "...causes and consequences of policy decisions improves our knowledge about society." Second, the study of the causes and consquences of public policy "...permits us to apply social science knowledge to the solution of practical problems" (Dye, 1981:6). Thus, policy studies can provide direction for future policy decisions in terms of "if...then" statements, and they can help to describe which policy process would best achieve those desired ends.

Finally, the retrospective study of public policymaking can help people to understand what government has been doing, and what the consquences have been. Prospectively, it can help raise the possibility of alternative courses of action (Weiss, 1982:303).

In sum, the study of the formulation of public policy can contribute to informed political discussion, to the advancement of political awareness, and to the improvement of the quality of public policy (Dye, 1981:6). Weiss (1982:289) reinforces the necessity of policy studies when she states...

> Research provides a background of data, empirical generalizations, and ideas that affect the way that policymakers think about problems. It influences their conceptualizations of the issues with which they deal; it affects the facets of the issue that they consider inevitable and unchangeable or amenableto policy action; it challenges some taken-for granted assumptions about appropriate goals and appropriate activities. Often, it helps them make sense of what they have been doing after the fact, so that theycome

> to understand which courses of action they have followed and which courses of action they have gone by default.

Thus, in this study, the formulation of the Secondary Education policy is viewed as a significant manifestation of one way in which education policy has been developed in the province of Alberta. A systematic analysis of this policymaking process may contribute to more enlightened policymaking in the future.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SECONDARY EDUCATION POLICY

Our educational system today is under criticism both provincailly and nationally. There is increasing pressure for accountability in education, and for the assurance that the educational system is meeting the expectations, values, and objectives of its citizens. Consquently, Albertans are witnessing major reviews in the secondary instructional program, in management and finance, and in the governance of our educational system.

When one considers the pervasive influence that educational public policy has on our lives, it becomes evident that citizens should understand, and be involved in the policy formulation process. The organizational groundwork for the formulation of public policy clearly should be founded in a reality mutually defined by citizens, stakeholding groups, and the policymakers (Fullan,1982; Berman and McLaughlin, 1976).

In recent years the Alberta Department of Education has adopted a consultative approach to the formulation of policy. The Deputy Minister (Bosetti, 1986) suggests three objectives in using such an approach:

1. To increase knowledge and understanding of the issues.
2. To test and expand the zone of tolerance of the stakeholding groups.
3. To enhance commitment to the adoption and implementation of the policy.

In addition, Alberta Education advocates the nuturing of a partnership approach in the educational policy formulation process. Thus, if Albertans are truly are to become partners in the process, it is important for them to understand how the process works.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study has examined the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy using the following questions as guidelines in conducting the research.

1. What were the processes implemented by Alberta Education in the formulation of the Secondary Education policy?

2. What were the significant issues perceived by the various actors in the environment that generated a need for the development of the Secondary Education policy?

3. To what extent did Alberta Education use a consultative approach in the policy formulation process?

3.1 At what points in the policy formulation process were themajor stakeholding groups consulted?

3.2 What role in the policy formulation process did the following stakeholding groups play?

   a. Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA)
   b. Alberta School Trustees' Association (ASTA)
   c. Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Association (ACSTA)
   d. Conference of Alberta Superintendents (CASS)
   e. Alberta Independent Schools and Colleges Association(AISCA)
   f. Minister's Advisory Committee
   g. Alberta Education

4. What individuals or groups influenced or attempted to influence the formulation of the policy?

4.1 What were their motives for becoming involved in the policy formulation process?

4.2 What mechanisms or processes were used by these individuals or groups to bring their views and demands to bear upon the policy formulation process?

4.3 What aspects of the process obstructed or facilitated the individual's or group's attempts to influence the policy formulation process?

4.4 To whom did these individuals or groups submit or otherwise communicate their views and demands with regard to the policy formulation process?

5. To what extent were elements of the following models reflected in the formulation of the Secondary Education policy?

A. The Systems Model
B. The Rational Model
D. The Elite Model
E. The Institutional Model
F. The Intergrated Systems Framework

The study involves an examination and analysis of the process by which the Secondary Education policy was formulated. Consequently, the study was bounded by the time period from February 1984, when the Minister of Education initiated a review of Alberta's secondary education program, to June 1985, when the Premier and the Minister officially announced the government's adoption of the "Secondary Education in Alberta Policy."

Secondly, the policy formulation process was reviewed and analysed in terms of six different theoretical models. The models served as six different perspectives from which to view the policy formulation process.

Finally, because of the number of stakeholders involved in the formulation of the policy and because each member of the stakeholding groups, theoretically at least, had an opportunity to influence policy direction both as an individual and as a member of the stakeholding group, the study was delimited to primary source documents (those briefs, reports, and letters submitted to Alberta Education) and other resources that were used as the research bases for the Alberta Secondary Education Review. Additionally, interviews were conducted to clarify and validate the various positions, views, and expectations of the major stakeholders in the policy formulation process.

The study was limited primarily by the availability and access to primary source materials in the form of written submissions, reports, and other such documents, as well as

by the availability of key stakeholding group members and their ability to accurately recall accurately past events. Consequently, a number of assumptions must be made explicit:

1. A review of the primary source documents and semi-structured interviews will provide sufficient evidence to determine the processes used and the influence exerted by the participants.

2. The documents will provide an accurate and adequate account of the significant events which took place and that are relevant to the purpose of the study.

3. The key actors in the policy formulation process can be identified using a modified leadership pool approach.

4. Those individuals who are identified as relevant key actors are able to recall with accuracy the past events and perceptions that are of relevance to the study.

In conclusion, the purpose of this study is to describe and explain the processes involved in the formulation of the Secondary Education policy. This policy is particularily significant because not only was the consultative approach employed to identify the views, expectations, and concerns of major stakeholding groups, but the policy statement is said to have taken into account those views, expectations and concerns. In addition, it is important to recognize the potentially pervasive effect the Secondary Education policy may have for the future and direction of the secondary education program in Alberta.

Finally, a detailed study of the consulative approach employed in the formulation of the Secondary Education policy, from the point of view of various theoretical frameworks, may facilitate a better understanding of the process, and perhaps enhance and enlighten future participation in the process of policy formulation.

Chapter 2

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter constitutes a review of the literature dealing with the formulation of public policy. For the purpose of this review, the policymaking process is viewed from the perspective of five different models: the systems model, the elite model, the group theory model, the institutional model, and finally, the rational model. The discussion and examination of these models is aimed at providing a multi-dimensional view of the policy formulation process.

Secondly, this chapter develops a conceptual framework as a basis upon which to analyze the policy formulation process. The framework incorporates a discussion of policy analysis, megapolicy, and metapolicy. A systems perspective provides the basis for the conceptual framework, along with a synthesis of Dror's (1968) optimal model for policymaking, Amara's (1972) framework for national goals and policy research, and Almond and Powell's (1966) conceptualization of political systems.

UTILITY OF SELECTED MODELS FOR POLICY ANALYSIS

Public policymaking is a very complex and dynamic process whose various components make different contributions to it (Dror, 1968). The policy sciences literature describes a considerable number of concepts and models which are intended to help one to understand the process of making public policy. The purpose of these conceptual models is to

simplify and clarify our thinking about government and politics; to identify important political forces in society; to communicate relevant knowledge about political life; to direct inquiry into politics; and finally, to suggest explanations for political events and outcomes (Dye, 1981:19).

Dunn (198:35) suggests that policy analysis is "...an applied science discipline which uses multiple methods of inquiry and arguments to produce and transform policy-relevant information that may be utilized in political settings to resolve policy problems."

Thus, policymaking remains a subtle art form for which there can be no fixed program. "Policy analysis is synonymous with creativity, which may be stimulated by theory and sharpened by practice, which can be learned but not taught" (Wildavsky,1979:3).

Because of the complexity of the policymaking process, the analyst's understanding of why policymakers do the things they do, may be enhanced by adopting a multi-dimensional point of view. Each of the numerous models that have been constructed in the past contributes a particular perspective that at a glance may appear to explain adequately a particular policy situation. However, in reality, most public policies can be better understood by combining a number of perspectives. Such a thought process may incorperate Janusian thinking (Cameron, 1984). Janusian thinking occurs when two contradictory concepts are held to be true simultaneously. Such thinking can engender the flexibilty which is a prerequisite for creativity and effective problem solving by exploiting seemingly contradictory characteristics simutaneously to respond to changing and different demands (Worth,1986).

In summary, the understanding of public policymaking can be enhanced through the application of a number of models to a discrete policymaking activity. In light of the policymaking process employed in the development of the "Secondary Education Policy",

the following models will be reviewed: the systems model, the elite model, the group model, the institutional model, and the rational model.

SYSTEMS THEORY: POLICY AS SYSTEM OUTPUT

Systems theory portrays policy as the response of a political system to forces brought to bear upon it from the environment. Environmental forces which affect the political system are viewed as inputs. The environment is the set of conditions or circumstances defined as external to the boundaries of the political system. The political system is that group of interrelated structures and processes which functions authoritatively to allocate values for a society. Outputs of the political system are authoritative value allocations of the system, and these allocations constitute public policy (Dye,1981:41).

Thus, public policy, from the systems perspective, is viewed as the output, which is the result of a process of transforming demands, supports, and other inputs into guidelines for future discretionary action. Policy demands occur when individuals or groups, in response to real or perceived environmental conditions, act to affect policy. This often is the result of a perceived discrepancy between what the individual or groups perceive themselves to have, and what they want. These perceived discrepancies then form the basis for policy decisions (Amara,1972:61).

Support in the policymaking process is rendered in the form of material support, involving the provision of resources and services; obedience to rules and regulations; participatory supports; and deference to power and authority. (Almond and Powell, 1966:25-26)

The policymaking process must transform these often conflicting demands into outputs (public policies) that will most likely generate further support from the significant components of the socio-political system. It is recognized then, that outputs may have a

modifying effect on the environment and that the demands arising from it may also have an effect upon the character of the political system. (Dye, 1981:42)

Dye(1981:43) poses six questions that enhance the value and utility of the systems model for policy analysis:

1. What are the significant dimensions of the environment that generate demands upon the political system?
2. What are the significant characteristics of the political system that enable it to transform demands into public policy and to preserve itself over time?
3. How do environmental inputs affect the character of the political system?
4. How do characteristics of the political system affect the content of public policy?
5. How do environmental inputs affect the content of public policy?
6. How does public policy affect, through feedback, the environment and the character of the political system?

The material identified below appears in the thesis but has been removed because of the unavailability of copyright permission.

FIGURE 1: THE SYSTEMS MODEL

Source: Dye, Thomas
Understanding Public Policy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall 1981, p. 42.

GROUP THEORY:POLICY AS GROUP EQUILIBRIUM

Baldridge, in his classic study of power and conflict in the university, describes policies as "...those decisions that bind the organization to important courses of action. Since policies are so important, people throughout the organization try to influence them in order to see that their special values are implemented" (Baldridge,1971:21).

Similarily, Dye (1981) argues from the group theory perspective that interaction among groups is the central fact of politics. Individuals with common interests and values band together to press their demands upon the government. Politics is really the struggle among groups to influence public policy. Thus bargaining is at the heart of the policymaking process. The task of the political system is to manage group conflict by establishing the rules of the game in the power struggle; arranging compromises in the form of public policy such that a minimum winning coalition of parties will be aligned behind each policy (Bauer 1968:13); and enforcing these compromises (Dye, 1981:27).

According to group theory, equilibrium is achieved in the group struggle with the formulation of a public policy that represents a binding decision to commit the various groups to one set of possible alternative actions, and to one set of goals and values (Baldridge, 1971:22). Changes in the relative influence of any interest group can be expected to result in changes in the public policy because policy tends to move in the direction of the winning coaltion and away from the desires of the groups losing influence.

Thus, group theory attempts to describe all meaningful activity in terms of the group struggle. Politicians are continually attempting to form a majority coalition of groups, while the policymakers are constantly responding to group pressures by bargaining, negotiating and compromising among the competing demands of influential groups (Dye,1981; Bauer,1968; Baldridge,1971).

The equilibrium of the whole interest group system is the result of several forces. First, there must be a large, nearly universal, latent group in society which supports the system and the prevailing rules of the game. Second, overlapping group membership helps to maintain the equilibrium by preventing any one group from moving too far from the prevailing norms and values. Finally. the checking and balancing resulting from group competition also helps to maintain equilibrium, because no single group constitutes a majority and the power of each group is checked by the power of the competing groups (Dye,1981).

The material identified below appears in the thesis but has been removed because of the unavailability of copyright permission.

FIGURE 2: THE GROUP MODEL

Source: Dye, Thomas
Understanding Public Policy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall. p. 27.

ELITE THEORY: POLICY AS ELITE PREFERENCE

In contrast to the systems model, the elite model is based on the assumption that public policy is the result of the preferences and values of the governing elite. The elite model focuses on the irony of democracy. It suggests that the masses are generally apathetic and ill-informed, thus leaving policy decisions to their elected representatives.

In essence then, policy flows downward from the governing elite to the masses, rather than arising from the values and demands of the masses. The irony is inherent in the democratic process that suggests that elected officals actually represent the needs and values of society, and the fact that they are accountable to the people through the election process.

Dye (1981: 29-30) succintly summarizes the key elements of the elite model in the following six points:

1. Society is divided into the few who have power and the many who do not. Only a small number of persons allocate values for society; the masses decide public policy.

2. The few who govern are not typical of the masses who are governed. Elites are drawn disproprtionately from the upper socioeconomic strata of society.

3. The movement of nonelites to elite positions must be continous to maintain stability and avoid revolution. Only nonelites who have accepted the basic elite consensus can be admitted to governing circles.

4. Elites share consensus on behalf of the basic values of the social system and the preservation of the system.

5. Public policy does not reflect demands of masses but rather the prevailing values of theelite. Changes in public policy will be incremental rather than revolutionary.

6. Active elites are subject to relatively little direct influence from apathetic masses. Elites influence masses more than masses influence elites (Dye, 1981: 29-30).

In Dye's (1981:30-31) discussion of the elite theory he identifies a number of important implications for policy analysis. First, if public policy is a reflection of the values and preferences of the governing elite, rather than the demands of the public, especially with a majority government in power, any change or innovation will be contingent upon a redefinition by elites of their own values. Thus, due to the conservative nature of a majority government, change will be slow and incremental, with the burden of the welfare of the masses resting upon the shoulders of the governing elite. Accordingly, elections take on a symbolic value to the masses. The masses, at best, have only indirect influence over the decisionmaking behavior of the elites by exercising their right to vote. Finally, the elite model operates on the premise that decisions are made by an elite few due to the largely passive, apathetic, and uninformed nature of the masses.

The material identified below appears in the thesis but has been removed because of the unavailablity of copyright permission.

FIGURE 3 : THE ELITE MODEL

Source: Dye, Thomas
Understanding Public Policy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall 1981, p. 29.

RATIONALISM: POLICY AS EFFICIENT GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

Dye (1981:31) defines a rational policy as one that is correctly designed to maximize "net value achievement". The term "net value achievement" requires that "...all relevant values of a society are known, that any sacrifice in one or more values that is required by a policy is more than compensated for by the attainment of other values".

Dye suggests that the concept of rationality is interchangeable with the concept of efficiency. Efficiency involves the calculation of all political, social and economic values sacrificed or achieved by public policy. In essence, it provides a criterion according to which a policy alternative is recommended if it results in a higher ratio of effectiveness to cost (Dunn,1981:272). Thus, a policy is rational when it is most efficient; that is to say, it is efficient if the ratio between the values it achieves and the values it sacrifices is positive and higher than any other policy alternative (Dye,1981:31).

However, Dror (1968:141) adds caution to the use of the rational model in improving decisions in policymaking. He recommends that "the various phases of pure-rationality policymaking should be developed in practice only insofar as it is economical to do so, and that the cost of the input into making policymaking more rational is less than the benefit of the output."

To select a rational policy Dye suggests that policymakers must know all of the society's value preferences and their relative weights; know all of the policy alternatives available, know all the consequences of each policy alternative; calculate the ratio of achieved to sacrificed societal values for each policy alternative; and select the most efficient policy alternative (Dye 1981:32).

The rational model operates on a number of assumptions. It assumes there can be a complete understanding of societal values; that all the necessary information about

alternative policies can be obtained; that there is predictive capacity to foresee accurately the consquences of alternate policies, and that intelligence is available to calculate correctly the net value system. The model requires a decision-making system that facilitates full rationality in policy formation (Dye,1981:32).

Finally, rationality tends to be treated as a relationship between means and ends, which, because of human limitations, is necessarily circumscribed (Wildavsky,1979:135). Herbert Simon (Wildavsky,1979:135) argues that "people are intendedly rational, their behavior is goal directed but, because their ability to calculate is limited and the world is complex, they do less well than they would like. Human rationality being bounded, people who would like to maximize end up 'satisficing', that is, being satisfied with a solution sufficient to get them past the present decision".

In conclusion, the knowlege and capacity that would be necessary to implement the rational model is beyond the abilīty of the policy analyst. Consequently, although the rational model is seldom used, itś utility remains as a guideline to assist the analyst to identify impediments to rationality.

The material identified below appears in the thesis but has been removed because of the unavailability of copyright permission.

FIGURE 4: THE RATIONAL MODEL

Source: Dye, Thomas
Understanding Public Policy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall 1981, P. 33.

INSTITUTIONALISM: POLICY AS INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUT

The political science perspective typically treats policymaking as a government prerogative, and policy as the product (Allison,1983). Dye (1981:1) confirms this point of view when he defines public policy as "whatever governments choose to do or not to do". Consequently, there is a potential relationship between public policy and governmental institutions. The perspective of policy as an institutional output suggests that policy does not actually become public policy until it is adopted, implemented, and enforced by a governmental institution. Dye (1981:21) identifies three distinctive characteristics that governmental institutions attribute to public policy. First, government lends legitimacy to public policy by attaching a legal obligation which commands the loyalty of citizens. Secondly, government public policy involves universality in that it extends to all people. Finally, only government can legitimately apply suasion to violators of its policy. Thus, the structure of governmental institutions may have important consequences for policy.

Government institutions are comprised of structured patterns of behavior of individuals and groups. The term "structure" denotes stability, and that these patterns tend to persist over time (Dye,1981:21). Consequently, the individuals within these structures may serve to facilitate or provide barriers to policy. For example, the Deputy Ministers, many of whom belonged to the career civil service, occupy the highest positions in the governmental bureaucracy next to the Ministers. They are the principal policy advisors and, according to a past Deputy Minister of Defense, the Deputy Minister "is often in the position of being able to push what he likes or believes in and 'block' what he fears or does not like, either at the policy formulation of at the implementation stage" (Sayeed,1973:91). Additionally, the human dimension of governmental institutions makes them vulnerable to the influence and pressure from various interest groups.

In sum, the utility of the institutional approach is that it draws attention to the potential relationship that may exist between institutional composition or structure and the economic forces that exist in the environment. These factors should be considered in the assessment of the impact of institutional arrangements on public policy (Dye,1981:23).

SUMMARY

The major purpose of these models is to simplify and clarify thinking about government and politics, to help identify important political forces in society, to communicate knowledge about political life and direct inquiry into it, and to suggest explanations for political events and outcomes (Dye,1981).

TOWARD A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The aim of policy analysis essentially is to enhance the decision making process involved in the creation and selection of policy alternatives. The crux of this process is increased rationality. E. S. Quade, former head of the mathematics department at the Rand Corporation, describes policy analysis as

> ...any type of analysis that generates and presents information in such a way as to improve the basis for policymakers to exercise their judgement...In policy analysis, the word analysis is used in the most general sense; it implies the use of intuition and judgement and encompasses not only the examination of policy by decomposition into its components but also the design and synthesis of new alternatives (E. S. Quade in Dunn,1981:35).

The basic process of policy analysis follows, in varying degrees of complexity, a rational decision making model which essentially involves the following process:

> 1) Faced with a problem, 2) a rational man first clarifies his goals, values, or objectives, and then ranks or otherwise organize them in his mind; 3) he then lists all important possible ways of-policies for- achieving his goals 4) and investigate all the important consequences that would follow from each of the alternative policies. 5) at which point he is in a position to compare consquences of each policy with goals 6) and so choose the policy with consquences most closely matching his own goals (Lindblom, 1968: 13).

Fischer (1980:189) contends that the policy analysis process can be enhanced by attending to six categories of politically relevant data (Table 1, Fischer, 1980: 188-189).

Table 1
Categories of Relevant Political Data

POLITICAL ACTORS	1. Political actors may be individuals, pressure groups, elect leaders, administrators of government agencies, poltical parties, opinion leaders, business leaders, and so on.
MOTIVES AND GOALS OF ACTORS	2. Each political actor will possess a number of motives, needs, interests,desires, goals and objectives that shape his or her order of preferences andactions. Even though political actorsat times conceal their motives and goals, they serve as a general guide to behavior.
BELIEFS AND VALUES OF ACTORS	3. The political actor's beliefsattitudes, and value systems establish his or her orientation to the empirical world. This frame of reference is a generalized statement of goals, specifying what is desirableand which means to utilize in achieving them. It may involve a disjointed set of beliefs and values, or it may be a well organized political ideology. The intensity with which a political actor holds a belief or value system will at times be a crucial factor.
POLITICAL RESOURCES (POWER AND INFLUENCE)	4. The most significant political actors will possess resources that translate into power and influence in the building of political coalitions and support. Such resources may be material or physical possessions, money, symbolic statuses, social, position, formation, skills, and so on.
POLITICAL DECISION RULES AND TIME	5. Political decisions will often be guided by specific decision rules, legislativerequirements, and existing laws, which will tend to channel many of the interactions between political actors.

POLITICAL DECISION SITES	6. Political decisions will occur at specific decision sites involving different rules, leverages disadvantages, and the like that will often have an important bearing on the outcomes. Also, the next time period or range over which the decisions extend may have an important influence on the political perceptions of the relevant actors.
PUBLIC OPINION AND POLITICAL CLIMATE	7. The general political temper of the times will influence the outcome to a considerable degree. For example, the more intensely dissatisfied large groups and strong actors become with the present situation, the more support may be available for innovative alternatives.
RELEVANT POLITCAL CULTURE	8. Different decisions will call differentpolitical values into question: equality before the law, civil liberties, representative control of institutions, equal opportunity, peaceful orientation toward other nations, fraternity, patriotism, etc.

This relevant political information can assist the policy analyst to define

> ..the general political environment in which the policy deliberation is set, as well as the specific aspect of the environment that has become an issue...Utilizing such a framework, the analyst begins the investigation grounded in specific political orientations located in society itself. As characterizations of the cognitive orientations of particular political groups, such frameworks permit the analyst to identify not only the problems to be solved but also the potentialities and limitations to which he or she must appeal in proposing solutions (Fischer, 1980: 189).

Thus, policymaking is a multi-faceted process that can be better understood by breaking it down into three dynamically interrelated stages. Dror (1968), in his development of an optimal model of public policymaking, identifies three such phases:

a) metapolicymaking,that is, policymaking on how to make policy;

b) policymaking in its usual sense, that is, making policy on substantive issues;

c) re-policymaking, that is making changes in policy based on feedback from the executing of policies (Dror,1968: 1960).

These three phases will be used in conjunction with a number of other models to create a system framework for the analysis of the Secondary Education Policy.

MEGAPOLICY

Megapolicies are a kind of master or grand policy that determines the "postures, assumptions, and main guidelines to be followed by specific policies" (Dror,1971:63). Essentially megapolicy can be viewed as the motivating forces and theoretical bases upon which policymakers make decisions. This foundation, however, is often implicit, and is a combination of tacit knowledge, theory and experience. Dror (1968) identifies twelve facets of a megapolicy, that once made explict, can provide a clear framework for further policy decisions. These facets include:

> 1) The establishment of overall goals; 2)the boundaries within which a certain policy is to be confined; 3) the early establishment of a explicit time preferences in respect to various policies and expected policy outputs; 4) the degree of risk to be accepted; 5) the choice between various degrees of change or innovation; 6) the degree of comprehensiveness or narrowness of a policy; 7) the extent to which a policy is directed at achieving given goals through a shock effect or coordintated change; 8) identification of relevant assumptions about the future; 9) the explication of the theoretical bases of policymaking; 10) the availability of resources; 11) the range of vaible policy instruments; and finally, 12) the extent to which concrete policies should be identical in their megapolicies or should reflect a mixture of different megapolicies (Dror,1971:63-73).

METAPOLICY

Optimal or good policies require a systems perspective. Thus, Dror (1968:160) uses the term metapolicy to denote policies about policymaking. These policies are designed to manage the policymaking system as a whole. Metapolicy can be viewed as an "overarching policy" on policy. That is to say a metapolicy establishes the overall goals, rules, and the basic orientation for discrete policymaking situations. The metapolicymaking stage includes seven phases:

1) Processing values
2) Processing reality
3) Processing problems
4) Surveying, processing, and developing resources
5) Designing, evaluating, and redesigning the policymaking system
6) Allocating problems, values, and resources
7) Determining policymaking strategy. (Dror,1968:163)

Since the purpose of this study is to examine the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy, special attention will be devoted to the first four phases of metapolicymaking.

A SYSTEM FRAMEWORK

FOR THE ANALYSIS OF THE SECONDARY EDUCATION POLICY

The primary purpose of a conceptual framework is to assist the policy analyst to identify, and attend to the most important elements of the policymaking process in question, and their interrelationships, in the simplest terms (Amara,1972:60).

> The work of policy formulation usually begins when recognizable problems appear, problems about which one can hypothesize possible courses of action and in relation to which one can articulate goals...It is not clear problems but diffuse worries, that appear. Political pressure groups become unusually active, or their activities become more telling; formal and informal social indicators give signs of unfavorable trends, or of trends that may be interpreted as unfavorable. There are signals, then, of a problem, but no one knows yet what the problem is...In other words the situation is such that the problem itself is problematic. Policy analysis contains processes for finding and constructing problems; it involves problem setting [structuring] in order to interpret inchoate signs of stress in the system (Rein and White, quoted in Dunn,1981:106).

Thus, the starting point for policymaking begins when there is a perceived "felt existence" of a problematic situation wherein a mismatch exists between the systems level of attainment (what it perceives to have) and its goals (what it perceives to want) (Dunn,1981; Amara,1972). The negation of this existing discrepancy results in a formation of policy that attempts to best bridge the gap between goals and attainment. To achieve this "optimal policy", a number of preliminary steps must first be taken to ensure that the selected policy alternative can best accomodate the present values, goals, and attainments of society, as well as the future societal conditions that it may be instrumental in producing.

FRAMEWORK

The foundations of the framework presented in figure 5 is based on a systems perspective which conceptualizes policymaking as a process by which inputs from the social system are converted into policy outputs. The framework, as conceived by Bosetti (1973), is subdivided to represent : 1) the social system, 2) inputs, 3) the conversion process, and 4) outputs. Bosetti adapts Amara's (1972) framework for national goals and policy research to describe the social system subdivision, and uses Almond and Powell's (1966) conceptualization of the operation of a political system to describe the input, conversion process, and output subdivisions. Finally, overarching the whole system framework are Dror's (1968) three stages of Optimal policymaking: metapolicymaking, policymaking, and postpolicymaking, as each phase provides feedback and further inputs into the policymaking stage, consequently affecting further direction of it activities.

The material below appears in the thesis but has been removed because of the unavailability of copyright permission.

FIGURE 5 : A SYSTEM FRAMEWORK FOR INTEGRATING PLANNING AND POLICYMAKING

Source: Bosetti, R. A.
"A System Framework for Integrating Planning and Policymaking."
Unpublished paper, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, 1973.

The material identified below appears in the thesis but has been removed because of the unavailability of copyright permission.

FIGURE 6: META POLICY PLANNING

Source: Bosetti, R. A.

"A System Framework for Integrating Planning and Policymaking." Unpublished paper, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, 1973.

THE SOCIAL SYSTEM

The social system subdivision suggests that values, goals, and attainments, and the discrepancy between goals and attainments, form the essential societal elements which must be considered in the process of policy formulation.

VALUES

Policy analysis is value dependent (Dunn,1981:89). Dror (1968:164) states that every society "has a general reservoir of values that change constantly and that differ in the degrees to which they are conscious, intensely held, realistic, or backed by power in their structure and formality, and in the way they are distributed".

Amara (1972:63) contends that although there can be little agreement in establishing a precise definition of values, it is generally agreed that they provide standards that determine how we act and what we want, as well as criteria by which we evaluate and order the ends we seek. For the purpose of policy formulation, it is necessary to take into account such matters as the distribution of values, relative weights which might be assigned to each value, the value stability, transmission, and change.

> The value-processing phase is highly influenced by political processes, which determine the values that should be realized by public policy. Values are processed mainly by means of interactions actions and collisions between political bodies, public organizations, and interest groups. The outcome depends largely on the power, involvement, and commitment of the differnet interest groups, on the policymaker's image of the 'public interests', and on the varoius personal and organizational characteristics of the main policymakers (Dror,1968:166).

Consequently, it must be recognized that bureaucrats (as well as elected officals) play a critical role in the realm of values to the extent that "they set and administer the processes by which policy disputes are raised, argued out, heard, and disposed of in the decision-making process" (Yates, 1981:33).

Thus, policymakers should be explicit about the value premises and implications of public decisions. Dunn (1981:254) delineates five major steps that can be taken to explore the value premises that underlie the selection of policy alternatives:

1) Identify all relevant objectives of a policy program.

2) Identify all stakeholders who affect and are affected by the alternatives or nonattainment of the objectives.

3) List the value premises that underlie each stakeholder's commitment to objectives.

4) Classify value premises into those that are simply expressions of personal taste or desire (value expressions); those that are judgements about the universal goodness or badness of the actions or conditions implied by the objective (value judgements).

5) Further classify value premises into those that provide a basis for explaining objectives, and those that provide a ground for justifying objectives.

Finally, while rational processes can be applied to explore the social implications, the political feasibility, and the costs of various value positions that underlie policy alternatives, the final value decisions are determined by human judgement, and therefore are subject to change.

GOALS AND NEEDS

The values which determine what society wants and through which perceptions of reality are filtered, have a direct influence on the goals to which society might subscribe and to the goals which might be sought through policy decisions (Bosetti,1973). Goals then, can be seen as statements which reflect concerns with specfic problems. It is often difficult to explicitly define goals operationally because of the dynamic nature of the situation, or because it requires many compromises of interests and considerations (Dror, 1968:137).

Goal preferences therefore tend to be ambiguous or loosely defined to facilitate consensus among groups with competing values. Political actors involved in policymaking are "frequently willing to change their positions in the consensus process for a number of reasons, including the realization that they cannot always succeed by pursuing their original positions" (Fischer, 1980:203).

Thus, the identification and ordering of goals requires some understanding of how goals are distributed among groups within society. Additionally, goals must be future oriented, as they provide the criteria to evaluate the attainment of policy formulated today, and are contingent upon the dynamic nature of value preferences of society.

In conclusion, goals, in a broad sense, are formally defined statements of purpose, that reflect society's aspirations toward possible futures (Amara, 1972:63).

ATTAINMENTS

Amara (1972:64) defines attainments as the "perceived status of society when social indicators are filtered through one's value system." In other words, attainments represent subjective measures of achievement or accomplishments. Amara (1972:64) suggests that it is the perceived discrepancy between goals and their level of attainment that instigates the need for a new or revised policy. Therefore, it is of critical importance to effective policymaking that there be an assessment of "...which groups perceive what attainment configurations, how the attainments are ranked by importance, and how these perceptions and rankings are changing with time" (Amara, 1972:64). This assessment will enhance the policymaker's understanding of the perceived reality of the situation, and reveal the discrepancy between the "is" and "ought" positions of the organization (Stringham,1974:40).

DISCREPANCIES

Zollschan (Smith,1973:201), in his discussion of how societal tensions result in changes in society, uses the term exigency to indicate "a discrepancy (for a person) between a consciously or unconsciously desired or expected state of affairs and an actual situation." It is the interaction of values, goals, and perceived attainments that gives rise to perceptions of discrepancies between what society perceives itself to have and what it perceives itself to want. Once the discrepancies are recognized and articulated, they become needs or demands that form the basis for the generation of policy intent and alternatives.

INPUTS

The major inputs to the policymaking process are those directly derived from the first three phases of Dror's (1968) metapolicymaking stage: the processing of values and needs;the processing of reality; and processing resources in the form of demands and supports (Bosetti, 1973).

DEMANDS

Demands are one of the major inputs into a political system that will influence policymaking. Almond and Powell (1966:25-26) identify four forms of demands: 1) the demand for allocations of goods and services; 2) the demand for the regulation of behavior; 3) the demand for participation in the political system; and 4) the demand for communication and information with regard to the system's norms, and legislators' policy intentions.

SUPPORTS

Supports are the second major form of input into the political system. They provide the resources that enable the political system to carry out its goals. Almond and Powell (1966:26) suggest that these kinds of supports can be classified as: 1) material support in the form of resources and services; 2) obedience to rules and regulations; 3) participatory supports; and 4) deference to power and authority.

In conclusion, the demands and supports that impinge upon the political system play a critical role in the shaping of public policy. The interaction and competition between formal and informal groups to gain a postion of leverage in the policymaking process, and in turn have their needs, values, and perceptions attended to in the final policy, create a system of bargaining, compromise, and tradeoffs. For these reasons, the necessity to maintain a system monitoring capability which "provides a quasi-independent and rational input into the policymaking process becomes obvious if policymaking is to be open to influence from the external environment and not entirely subject to influence only from the political elites who normally articulate demands and supports within the system" (Bosetti, 1973).

THE CONVERSION PROCESS

The conversion process in policymaking is the process by which the system transforms the supports, demands, and other inputs into guidelines for future discretionary actions, and are then implemented (Almond and Powell, 1966:29).

In the context of a political system, the overarching goal of this process is "... to make the kinds of policy decisions most likely to generate further support from significant components of the socio-political system" (Bosetti. 1973).

SUMMARY

The systems framework for the analysis of public policymaking, as conceived by Bosetti (1973), attempts to integrate policy planning with policymaking. The policy planning phase essentially deals with policy analysis and involves the following process:

1) Identification of problems in terms of discrepancies between goals and attainments,
2) identification of referenced values and goals,
3) descriptions and evaluations of current conditions,
4) identification of policy alternatives,
5) analysis of the implications of each alternative, and
6) development of criteria for selection from among alternatives (Bosetti,1973:15).

In sum, the conceptual framework discussed in the previous section represents an optimal situation in which planning and policymaking form related dimensions of the process of converting societal inputs into policies which more effectively reduce the mismatch between what society wants and what it perceives to have.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the literature dealing with the formulation of public policy. In an attempt to present a multidimensional view of the policymaking process, five different models were discussed: the systems model, the elite model, the group theory model, the institutional model, and the rational model.

In the development of a conceptual framework for the analysis of the policymaking process, the concepts of megapolicy and metapolicy were presented as well as were various views on policy analysis.

Finally, a conceptual model was developed and discussed providing a systems framework for the analysis of the planning and policy formulation process that may be used in public policymaking.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Introduction

The central purpose of this study was to investigate and explain the processes involved in the formulation of the Secondary Education policy. The policymaking process was analyzed from the perspective of the six coneptual frameworks discussed in chapter two. The study attempted to make explicit what actually took place, in a restrospective sense, rather than to predict what relations could be found. Hence, a case study approach from an historical perspective was adopted to accomplish this purpose. Kerlinger (1973: 702) advocates this approach when he states that "historical research, per se has great value, because it is necessary to know and to understand educational accomplishments and trends of the past in order to gain perspective on present and future directions."

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

There are a number of methodological issues that are of concern to any researcher. In the study of the formulation of policy, Gerl en (1968b) identifies a number of methodological issues. The following is a discussion of those issues that are considered to be of particular significance to the methodology adopted in this study.

RELIABILITY

Reliability relates to the "level of internal consistency or stability of the measuring device over time" (Borg and Gall, 1983:281). Thus, reliability is concerned with the accuracy or precision of a measuring instrument (Kerlinger, 1983:443). This is of particular importance to studies on policy formulation that rely on a single set of observations made over a relatively short period of time, and with a single set of interviews with a number of persons in policymaking situations (Gergen, 1968b:210). Therefore, it becomes obvious that reliability is closely linked to validity. Kerlinger (1973:455) concludes that "if it were known that a given observation were perfectly valid, reliability would not be an issue."

INVESTIGATOR BIAS

Investigator bias refers to the potential effects that the investigator himself may have on what he studies. This may be of particular significance in the face-to-face interview in which the respondent "bargains with the interviewer in order to receive certain outcomes" (Gergen, 1968b:212). Additionally, to the extent that the investigator has an emotional investment in the outcome of his observation, there is a risk that his observations may not reflect what he actually sees. The "attitudinal dispositions of the researcher may cause him to scan his environment in a biased fashion" (Gergen, 1968b:213).

Finally, the researcher's perceptual bias may result in premature closure on research problems. thus failing to account for highly relevant but initially unconsidered occurances (Gergen, 1968b:213).

QUESTION BIAS

When conducting interviews another form of investigator bias may be introduced by virtue of the nature of the question. That is to suggest that "regardless of who may be doing the asking, a particular question may elicit responses determined by characteristics of the

question itself rather than the 'state of nature"' (Gergen, 1968b:215). The researcher must formulate questions that are of relevance to the respondent and that do not encourage the respondent to formulate an opinion for the first time in the interview itself. Gergen (1968b:215) suggests that "spontaneous opinions are unreliable and probably of little predictive value." The use of open-ended questions can help to minimize this type of bias.

RETROSPECTIVE BIAS

Retrospective bias is primarily germane to those instances in which a respondent is asked to reconstruct events or happenings that occurred at some earlier time. With the passage of time, the respondent may interpret past events using concepts and perspectives that originated in more recent time (Borg and Gall, 1983:820). Synder and Paige (Gergen 1968b:219) suggest that retrospective bias can be reduced by providing a chronology of various events for the respondent to assist him to recall more accurately his and other's behavior, and to increase the richness of his mental associations.

METHODOLOGY

CASE STUDY APPROACH

The purpose of this study was to examine the process of formulating a particular public policy. Its intent was to make explicit the details of the processes implemented by the government, to enhance an understanding of how policy is formulated, and to gain a perspective on the present and perhaps future directions of public policymaking in Alberta.

The case study approach was adopted as it "emphasizes the total situation or combination of factors, the description of the process or sequence of events in which behavior occurs" (Gee, 1950:230). The case method provides a more or less continuous picture through time of the experiences, social forces, and influences to which the unit has been subject (Fairchild, 1962).

The case study was conducted from an historical perspective, as it attempted to explain "what was", in a retrospective sense. Ary et al (1979:312) explains the purpose of conducting research from the historical perspective:

> Historical research is the attempt to establish facts and arrive at conclusions concerning the past. The historian systematically and objectively locates, evaluates, and interprets evidence from which we can learn about the past. Based on the evidence the historian draws conclusions regarding the past so as to increase our knowledge of how and why past events occurred and the process by which the past became the present. The hoped for results is increased understanding of the present and a more rational basis for making present choices.

Kimball Young (Gee, 1950:246-248) succinctly summarizes the advantages and disadvantages of the case study from an historical perspective. He identifies the following advantages:

> [First], the case study gives a more or less continuous picture through time of the individual's interpretation of his own experience and often that of others...the nature of social reality is revealed only when we know the meaning which people put upon their experiences. [Secondly], the case study furnishes a picture of past situations which gave rise to new meanings and new responses...[Thirdly], repetitions of situations, meanings, and responses may be noted and used for comparative purposes in forming generalizations...and finally, by the use of the case-study method inferences and generalizations are based upon an intimate knowledge of the situation and of the habits and attitudes of the persons interacting.

The major limitations of the case study method from an historical perespective relate to possible selective retention of relevant data by archives, as well as the possibility that "records are open to errors of perception, memory, judgement, and unconscious bias with a special tendency to over emphasize unusual events"

(K. Young in Gee, 1950:247). Such limitations can in part be overcome by conducting open ended interviews with relevant actors associated with the process under investigation in order to validate the activities and event described in the archives. Secondly, the discovery of internal consistency in the records in question may also offset some of the concerns dealing with the previous biases.

DATA COLLECTION

Gergen (1968b) suggests that policy is historically bound, and that it is almost impossible to freeze the process at any one point and gain an adequate conceptualization. For the purpose of this study, the policy process was delimited to the formulation period and was therefore bounded by the time period from February 1984, when the Minister of Education initiated a review of Alberta's secondary education program, to June 1985, when the Premier and the Minister officially announced the Secondary Education policy. The objective of the data collection was to construct the chronology of events that took place in the policy formulation process during the given time frame. The chronology served as an organizing framework for the actual analysis of the policymaking process.

The data collection was primarily derived from primary sources. Kerlinger (1973:702) defines primary and secondary source documents in the following way:

> A primary source document is the original repository of an historical datum, like anoriginal record kept of an important occasion, an eyewitness description of an event, a photograph, minutes of organizational meetings...A secondary source is an account or record of an historical event or circumstance one or more steps removed from an original repository.

Primary source documents such as correspondence, reports, memoranda, briefs, new releases, and other relevant documents were obtained from the files of Alberta Education, and other major stakeholder groups involved in, or associated with the policy

formulation process. These groups were delimited to the ATA, ASTA, ACSTA, CASS, AISCA and the Minister's Advisory Committee. To supplement and validate the data, interview were conducted with the significant actors of the aforementioned stakeholding groups.

The use of primary sources raises the concern for validity and reliability. To determine the genuineness of the document, the test of content validity, as well as both internal and external criticism were considered. External criticism is concerned with the authenticity of the document. "Did X really write this paper? If X wrote the paper, was he a competent and truthful witness?" (Kerlinger, 1973:702). Internal criticism deals with the content of the document and its meaning. It examines what the author said, and the validity of his statement. Additionally, interviews were conducted with the relevant actors, knowledgable of the phase in the process under question, to assist in the verification of the reliability of the documents.

INTERVIEWS

A semi-structured interview process was used to confirm or validate data already gathered, or to obtain supplementary data. The interviews were conducted using an interview guide. The guide consisted of a number of specific, yet open-ended questions that were approved by a panel of individuals familiar with the policy. These people viewed the guide for relevancy of the content to the purpose of the study and the policy, as well as for clarity in the wording and meaning of the questions.

The semi-structured interview was selected because the interview guide makes it possible to "meet the specific objectives of the study and to standardize the situation to some degree" (Borg and Gall, 1983:44). However, because the interviews were semi-structured, the interviewer, using the guide as a starting point, was then able to probe more deeply, using open-ended questions in order to obtain more complete data. This method

provides "a desirable combination of objectivity and depth and often permits gathering valuable data that could not be successfully obtained by any other approach" (Borg and Gall, 1983:441).

The respondents selected for the interview were chosen on the basis of their knowledge and position of authority in relation to the policy under investigation. Consequently, such people as the Deputy Minister of Education, Director of the Secondary Education Program Review, Chairman of the Minister's Advisory Committee, and key members of the stakeholding groups were interviewed. Gergen (1968b:194-197) discusses three methods for identifying key actors in the policy formulation process: The reputational approach, the positional method, and the leadership approach.

The reputational approach entails asking various knowledgable persons in the community to nominate persons whom they feel to be most influential, and this list is then submitted to a panel of experts who then vote on who they feel to be most influential. The top influentials are then interviewed and asked to identify additional people who are influential, but who may not be known publicly (Gergen, 1968:194). The positional method simply selects those individuals who occupy formal positions of public leadership. The positional approach rests on the assumption that "it is the postion alone that forms the basis of leverage, and not the particular capacities of the occupant" (Gergen, 1968:196). Finally, the leadership pool approach involves the selection of a group of knowledgeable persons holding or who had held formal postions of authority with respect to the policy process under consideration.

In conclusion, the interviews assisted in the attainment of factual information as to how respondents viewed the sequence of events in the policy formulation process, and the behavior of those associated with the Secondary Education policy.

DATA ANALYSIS

The central objective in the collection of data was to create an accurate chronology of the sequence of events involved in the formulation of the Secondary Education policy. The chronology of the policymaking process was validated by submitting it to individuals on the basis of their postion of authority and familiarity with the policy. They assessed the chronology for its accuracy in terms of the time line, sequencing of events, and the content. This then provided the data base for the detailed analysis of the policymaking process in terms of the conceptual frameworks discussed in chapter two.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this chapter was to explain the research design of this study. The basic methodology adopted was a case study approach from an historical perspective. Methodology issues such as the concern for reliability, and bias in the collection and analysis of data were discussed in relation to the methodology implemented in the study. Finally, the limitations of the selected methodology were made explicit. By reviewing the research design of this study the limitations and generalizability of the study's findings should be clearer, as well as its possible utility to the reader.

Chapter 4

THE POLICY FORMULATION PROCESS

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the processes involved in the formulation of Alberta's Secondary Education policy. It then briefly dicusses the actual framework of the policy statement, attempting to draw from it implications for Alberta Education, the school system, administrators, teachers, and finally the student. The intent of this chapter is to describe and explain the policy formulation process and to provide an organizational framework as a basis for an anlysis of the process. This analysis is provided in chapter six.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE FORMULATION OF THE SECONDARY EDUCATION POLICY

The Alberta government has allocated directly and indirectly an annual budject of nearly 1.7 billion dollars to education (k to 12), making education one of its highest priorities. Premier Lougheed, in his address to the Canadian Education Association in September 1984, made this point very clear when he emphasized the need to evaluate our educational system periodically, and to question the role of the school in society. He added that "... if you have a good education system, the community at large is more able to survive as an

entity-to progress and to grow- providing fine opportunities for our young people," (Secondary Education in Alberta, Policy Statement, 1985:3).

Prior to the Premier's statement, on February 1984, the Honourable David King, Minister of Education, announced the initiation of a major review of secondary education programs. The intent of the review was to determine a balance of what young people, parents and adults need, want, and expect from our school system now and in the future. The government recognized that high quality education is necessary in our increasingly complex and competitive world, and that our educational system must be designed to prepare our youth to meet the challenges of the future.

ASSESSING THE NEED FOR CHANGE

Over the recent years, education has come under criticism both provincially and nationally. With a budget of over one billion dollars for provincial education the government felt the need to review and to articulate firm direction for the educational system, and to ensure that it met the expectations and objectives of Albertans. The vision shared by Alberta Education can best be summarized in the words of the Deputy Minister:

> We must give the education system greater purpose and direction, so that its resources are focused on the development and the learning of children; so that the children coming out of the system would have the knowledge, the skills, the attitudes, and the capabilities needed for today's world, that would give them the capacity to shape the course of future events (Bosetti, June 1986).

Thus, it was the view of Alberta Education that the educational system must be held accountable for its products, and therefore must develop better and more efficient ways of managing the system. The government heard Albertans's suggesting that an educational system based on a philosopy of education developed in the 1960's, where the emphasis was on helping children to find themselves, and to discover their potential, with a

curriculum designed to provide an opportunity for people to succeed, regardless of their level of accomplishment, was a system no longer conducive to the value system of the 1980's, where the world is becoming increasingly complex and more competitive. Thus, in such a society standards come into question in of evaluating what children are learning and the utility of that knowledge in helping them to become functioning and productive members of society.

PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION AND TESTING OF VALUES

Before any initiatives were launched by Alberta Education, a preliminary investigation was conducted in order to assess the potential gap in the system between what Albertan's felt should be, and what actually existed. In other words, Alberta Education wanted to investigate the potential issues that had to be addressed, if a secondary school review was to be initiated. This investigation involved a number of processes.

First a preliminary review of the recent literature on educational reform and school effectiveness was undertaken. Secondly, Alberta Education attempted to gain a perspective of the perceptions of the "people in the system" and their views on the need for change. Consequently, people "who might know", such as curriculum experts, superintendents, principals, teachers and parents, were consulted to ascertain their views on what was good or in need of change in the current secondary education progam. The results seemed to indicate a dissatisfaction with a lack of standards and direction in the system.

The third step in the preliminary investigation was to launch a comprehensive evaluation policy. Provincially controlled diploma examinations were instituted to determine the following: 1) how well students were achieving; 2) were there any apparent provincial standards; and 3) was it possible to establish standards for achievement? Next, Alberta Education articulated provincial teacher, student, school, system, and program

evaluation megapolicies, and required school jurisdictions to formulate local policies which were consistent with the provincial policies and also reflected local needs.

Finally, Alberta Education, as well as the Minister's Advisory Committee reviewed the letters, briefs, and discussion papers submitted by concerned Albertans. Their conclusion was that from the information gathered to this point, there was sufficient evidence to indicate that the present educational system in Alberta was not operating within the present value system, rather it was operating within a value system better suited to the 1960's-1970's (Minister of Education,1986). Thus, the task before Alberta Education was to re-evaluate the educational system in its totality, with special emphasis on its governance structure, the substance of what the system was delivering, and the way in which it was managed and financed. The intent of such an evaluation was to give the system a more defined purpose and direction, embedded in a value system of the 1980's, yet flexible enough to accomodate the changes and challenges of the future. Hence, these factors can be seen as the motivating factors behind the launching of the Secondary Education Review.

THE SECONDARY EDUCATION REVIEW PROCESS

In order to create an educational system that would result in a balance among what young people, parents, and other adults want, need and expect from our system now and in the future, the Secondary Education Review began with an attempt to determine what the public perceived to be the critical issues, concerns, and expectations of the secondary school system. Hence, to facilitate this objective, Alberta Education adopted a consultative approach to the review process. The Review proceeded in a number of ways.

In March 1984, the public was invited to participate in a survey. A brochure describing the current secondary education program, and an accompanying questionnaire was distributed to over 856,000 households in Alberta. In the 10,000 responses received

by Alberta Education, a disproportionately high percentage of responses were from parents and teachers. The primary purpose of the review, however, was to give all Albertan's an opportunity to learn about and to understand the secondary education program in Alberta. Thus, the brochure was intended to serve as an information base. The secondary purpose of the information package was, in addition to providing a knowledge base, to invite Albertans to express their views and expectations of what the secondary education program should be, by filling out the open-ended questionnaire provided. In addition, members of the Minister's Advisory Committee and the Alberta Education Project Team attended a series of public forums sponsored with the assistance of the Alberta Federation of Home and School Association, and reviewed approximately 110 written briefs submitted by individuals, other government departments, and groups with a special interest in education, such as school boards, teachers, and parent groups. Further reports and responses were received through the Minister and other key Alberta Education member's meetings with the Alberta Teachers' Association, Alberta School Trustees' Association, Conference of Albert School Superintendents, University personnel, and the Committee on Tolerance and Understanding.

In May 1984, a Gallup Poll of 1,054 randomly selected adults residing in Alberta was commissioned by Alberta Education. The Poll was conducted through personal, in-home interviews, using selected topics from the questionnaire distributed in March 1984. The purpose of the Gallup Poll was to obtain a representative sample reflecting the views and expectations of Albertans with regard to the present educational system (Deputy Minister).

Since students are the core of our educational system, a stratified random sample of 2,821 students in grades ten and twelve was selected on a stratified random sample basis from across the province of Alberta to participate in an opinionnaire in which they were asked to rank eighty-two objectives which a good secondary school should seek to achieve,

in terms of their importance. The opinionnaire used was the similar to the one used in a survey conducted in 1973. Therefore, Alberta Education was able to obatain an indication of the changing attitudes of secondary education students over an eleven year period (Chairman of Minister's Advisory Committee, 1986).

Finally, the data collection for the Secondary Education Review process also involved the review of a number of commissioned academic reports that would provide assistance in the shaping of the future of Alberta's secondary education system. These reports covered such areas as the ways students learn best, the nature of the adolescent, anticipated needs of the future, secondary education in other countries and provinces, and finally, a historical review of educational change in Alberta. Consequently, the month of June 1984, was devoted to the analysis of the public opinion and research studies.

In summary, the initial phases of the Secondary Education Review process which took place over the period of February 1984, to June 1984, began with the establishment of an administrative structure to oversee the details of the review, and ended with an analysis of the public opinions gathered and the research studies that had been commissioned. This phase of the review focused on assessing the views and expectations Albertan's with regard to the present and future direction of Alberta's secondary education program. It was the view of Alberta Education, that in order to create a policy that would be accepted, and then implemented, it was necessary to create a framework based upon the views and expectations mutually shared by Albertans. Thus, the review process can be viewed as serving essentially three functions:

1) it creates an opportunity to increase the public's awareness and understanding of the secondary education program and critically related issues;

2) it tests and expands the zone of tolerance and acceptability with regard to possible changes;

3) it identifies critical issues, views and expectations that the new policy should accomodate (Deputy Minister of Education, 1986).

Thus, the information gathered through this process helped to shape the framework which would guide the direction of secondary education in the future.

The administrative structure of the review process established in February 1984, was directed by a twelve member Project team appointed by Albert Education, and coordinated by Dr. Phillip Lamoureux. The team was responsible for the collection and analysis of the public opinion surveys, summarizing pertinent literature, and managing the research projects that were relevant to the review. From the data obtained, concerns and issues were identified, principles were suggested for improving the secondary education system, and policy options were formulated for the consideration of the Minister's Advisory Committee.

In February 1984, a Minister's Advisory Committee was appointed to assist the Minister of Education to review submissions and information collected, and to formulate a policy framework directed at changes in the secondary education system. Unlike the Alberta Education Project Team, which was comprised of individuals selected for their knowledge and expertise in the field of secondary education, the Advisory Committee was comprised of eight individuals thought to be representative of Albertans (with one representative being from the N.W.T., as they use Alberta's school curriculum) and especially those with a stake in secondary education. Thus, the committee, chaired by MLA Halvar Jonson, also consisted of parents, students, and members from the educational, business, and industrial community, selected from across the province of Alberta.

The second phase of the Secondary Education Process involved the release of three documents in January 1985. These documents were the result of the discussions,

deliberations, and analysis of the information collected in the first phase of the review. The first of these documents entitled "Foundations for the Future," was the report of the Minister's Advisory Committee. The purpose of the report was to "respond to the major issues identified during the review process and to present recommendations for future secondary education in Alberta," (Foundations for the Future, 1985: 2). The report makes eighty-eight recommendations for the improvement of the current secondary education instructional program.

The second report, entitled "Alberta's Secondary Education Program: The Public's View," summarizes the views and concerns of Albertans gathered through their responses to the opinionnaire, questionnaire, and the Gallup Poll, as well as their submissions of briefs and letters and their participation in the public forums. The report discusses the public's views under four basic issues: 1) The purpose of secondary education; 2) The content of the curriculum; 3) How students learn best; 4) The distribution of rights, roles and responsibilities among parents, teachers, Alberta Education, and society at large.

The third report reviews current literature on recent educational reform and critical societal issues. In the document entitled "Alberta Secondary Education Review: Research Bases," a synopsis is given of four reports commissioned by Alberta Education. These reports examined today's adolescent; a history of secondary education in Alberta; a comparative outline of education in five American states, Japan, and six European countries; and finally, the future and secondary education in Alberta. In the final "futures" study a team of educators attempted to discern important issues and concerns, and to articulate the implications that these might have in developing a policy statement for the future direction of secondary education in Alberta. To assist in this task a report prepared by L.J. D'Amore and Associates Ltd. of Montreal, entitled "Images of the Future," was used.

After the preliminary release of these reports, the Minister of Education once again invited those Albertans interested in secondary education to respond to the eighty-eight recommendations made by the Minister's Advisory Committee in "Foundations for the Future". Public meetings were held through out the province, and written reactions were received, analyzed, and considered in forming the final policy documents.

The secondary education review process culminated with the formulation of the final policy statement. The review provided the framework and direction for the policy document. The actual writing of the policy, however, was a rather complex process. Essentially three different groups submitted policy recommendations or alteratives: The Minister's Advisory Committee, Dr. Phillip Lamoureux, director of the Secondary Education Review on behalf of the Alberta Education Project Team, and Dr. George Bevan, director of curriculum for Alberta Education.

In preparing the various policy alternatives a number of guiding questions were used. First, if one was to accept the premise that educational systems should be designed to prepare its participants for living as productive cooperating citizens in today's society, to assist them in aquiring the knowledge and capablities to influence the society of the future (Deputy Minister of Education, 1986), then the following questions must be answered:

1) What changes in the present educational system must be made to help education to fit the needs of Albertans in the future?

2) What structures must be put in place to facilitate meeting the needs identified?

3) Do the outcomes of questions one and two fall within the value framework of society?

Thus, once all the policy recommendations and alteratives were submitted, a final policy document was created in the office of the Deputy Minister of Education. This document was a synthesis of previous recommendations that not only responded to the aforementioned guiding questions, but also fulfilled the following criteria: Is the

recommended policy alternative consistent with what the future studies predicted; with the identified views and expectations of Albertans; and finally, with what academic perspectives say should be? Secondly, will the policy effect the intellectual development of children and provide them with the knowledge, attitudes and skills necessary for the future; and finally, is the policy feasible within the existing system of education in Alberta? (Deputy Minister of Education, 1986).

The final draft of the policy document was then submitted to the Minister of Education, the Minister's Advisory Committee, and finally Government Caucus for further recommendations and revisions. This process was deemed necessary to ensure not only the political feasibility of the policy, but also that it was congruent with the views and expectations of the broad electorate, or in other words, the value system of society. In essence then, the final policy statement "Secondary Education in Alberta", officially released by Premier Lougheed and Education Minister David King, on 12 June 1985, was discussed, reviewed and revised in concert by Alberta Education, the Minister and his Advisory Committee, and Government Caucus.

In summary, the Secondary Education Review process can be termed as a consultative approach to the formulation of public policy whereby the government attempted to consult with various dimensions of its broad electorate (table 2). Albertans were involved in the identification and clarification of the problems in the present secondary education program in Alberta. The views and expectations expressed by Albertans were used as the value base from which policy alternatives concerning the future direction of secondary education in Alberta were generated.

Table 2
The Political Dimension of the Consultative Process Employed in the Secondary Education Review

PUBLIC	EXPERTISE	QUASI POLITICAL	PURE POLITICAL
.Opinionnaire .Survey .Gallup Poll .Public Forums .Written Submissions	.Project Team .Commissioned Reports .Alberta Education	.Minister's Advisory Committee	.Minister of Education .Caucus

SECONDARY EDUCATION IN ALBERTA: POLICY STATEMENT

The policy statement on Alberta secondary education is the Alberta Government's position on the future of secondary education in Alberta. The policy is a result of a thorough review of the secondary education program. The review involved input from Alberta Education, the academic community, stakeholder groups, as well as from students and the general public.

The focus of the policy is on the student, and on providing the student with the necessary skills, attitudes and knowledge to be able to recognize and make meaningful choices.

The policy identifies eight principles that provide a basis from which a framework will be developed to improve secondary education. The principles reflect the aim of education, which is to "...to develop the knowledge, the skills and the positive attitudes of individuals so that they will be self-confident, capable and committed to setting goals, making informed choices, and acting in ways that will improve their own lives and the life of their community," (Secondary Education in Alberta: Policy Statement, 1985: 7).

The principles identified are both comprehensive and enduring and reflect the following four points:

> 1) a respect for the unique nature and worth of each individual,
>
> 2) a commitment to the pursuit of knowledge, learning and excellence,
>
> 3) a commitment to meaninful participation in our democratic society,
>
> 4) a commitment to educating young people to assume responsibility for themselves and for the future direction of society (Secondary Education in Alberta: Policy Statement, 1985: 7).

The policy recognizes that the implementation of the programs and the changes envisioned require time, with its earliest impact being in the late 1980's, and its full impact on students graduating in the 1990's. In addition, no program can be successful without effective and dedicated classroom teachers. Therefore, the secondary school policy puts much emphasis on a partnership approach to education.

In establishing a plan for new secondary education programs, the policy document utilizes the following eight principles:

> 1) The secondary school, in cooperation with other agencies in society, must assist each student to become a competent, confident and respnsible individual. However, the secondary school must assume primary responsibility for the intellectual development of each student and for fostering the desire for lifelong, self-directed learning.
>
> 2) The development and implementation of the instructional program must take into account the following considerations:
>
> . the nature and needs of the learner
> . the nature and needs of a changing society
> . the nature of knowledge in each subject area
> . the learning environment

3) Secondary schools must prepare students for responsible citizenship in a society which is changing constantly. The best preparation for students to enable them to anticipate and shape the future is a broad general education with emphasis on critical and creative thinking, communication, personal development, science and technology, and an understanding of the community.

4) Secondary schools must assist students ot recognize principles and develoop personal values that enhance responsible moral and ethical behaviour.

5) Opportunities must be provided to involve the community in secondary education programs and to recognize and support learning experiences which take place outside of schools.

6) The secondary education system must use technology to enhance learning and to facilitate access to equitable educational opportunities for all students, regardless of a bility, circumstance or location.

7) Secondary education programs must recognize and must be adapted to meet the wide range of needs and abilities of students.

8) The purposes, goals, content, and delivery of secondary education must be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that innovation and excellence are fostered, and that the changing needs of students and society are met (Secondary Education in Alberta: Policy Statement, 1985:7-9).

The document also identifies the following nine goals that secondary schools should try to achieve:

Education should help students recognize, make, and act on good choices. Within this broad aim, the goals of secondary schools are to assist students to:

. develop the ability to think conceptually, critically and creatively, to aquire and apply problem-solving skills, to apply principles of logic, and to use different modes of inquiry;
. master effective language and communication skills, including the ability to use communications technology;. aquire basic knowledge, skills and positive attitudes needed
to become responsible citizens and contributing members of society;. learn about the interdependent nature of the

> world, through a study of history, geography, and political and economic systems; become aware of the expectations, and be prepared for the opportunities of the workplace-expecations that will be faced as employees or employers; expectation that well be faced as entrepreneurs or volunteers; assume increasing responsibility for independent and continuous learning, and develop positive attitudes towards learning while in school, in preparation for self-directed, lifelong educatinal experiences; learn about themselves and develop positive, realistic self-images; develop constuctive relationships with others based on respect, trust, cooperation, consideration and caring as one aspect of moral and ethical behaviour; develop cultural and recreational interests and realize personal aspirations (Secondary Eduaction in Alberta: Policy Statement, 1985:13).

The policy document specifically outlines the roles that the Junior and Senior High Schools should perform. From these goals and specific roles of secondary schools, a number of directional statements were developed to give further direction to planning programs. The directional statements reflect six general areas: guidelines for programs, standards and evaluation, technology, community partnership, ethics and values, and program reviews. The policy document also develops a number of concepts for translating these principles, goals, and directional statements into a comprehensive program of study. The intent of this policy framework is to ensure that the secondary program is designed to meet the goals of secondary education, that students will aquire basic knowledge, skills, and positive attitudes through a broad base of general education and will ensure that the students are challenged to reach their full potential, (Lamoureux, November 1985, interview).

IMPLICATIONS OF THE POLICY STATEMENT FOR THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM OF STUDIES

The Secondary Education Policy Statement provides an outline of the Government of Alberta's basic position on the role, purpose, and content of the secondary instructional

program. The policy provides the necessary framework that will provide the direction of decisions affecting the future development of the secondary instructional program.

At this point in time it would be difficult to assess completely the impact of the policy statement on the secondary instructional program because the implementation plans are still being formed. However, Dr. Lamoureux, Coordinator of the Secondary Education Review Project Team, identifies a number of implications, based on the guiding principles and directional statements, that will have an effect on the Department of Education, the school systems, and the system's professional staff and students. Many of the implications reflect the literature on effective schools (Purkey and Smith, 1985), and the view of planned change (Fullan, 1982; Elmore, 1980; and Berman and McLaughlin, 1976).

From the perspective of Alberta Education, Lamoureux suggests that the policy statement provides for a number of conditions which are essential to the improvement of the secondary instructional program.

First, a major priority for Alberta Education will be to facilitate the attainment of the goals, which have originated from the perception of respondents to the Secondary Education Review. Lamoureux states that these goals "must become known and used in the development and implementation of the instructional program," (unpublished document, Lamoureux, 1985).

Secondly, Alberta Education must ensure an articulated curriculm that will provide sufficient time for students to acquire a broad general education through core and complementary courses. Lamoureux supports Sizer's (Purkey and Smith, 1985:358) belief that "a rich, in-depth curriculum at the secondary level that challenges all students...may be preferable to the superficial study of many [unrelated] subjects," as it will assist students in acquiring essential knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

Finally, in order for Alberta Education to provide for equitable educational opportunities to all secondary school students, it may be necessary in some regions for the

school to engage in a collaborative effort with interested individuals and associations in the community.

From a school systems perspective, Lamoureux identifies three implications. First, each school jurisdiction should develop and subscribe to a clear statement of goals which is consistent with those stated in the Policy Statement. The importance of communication and understanding of these goals should be facilitated through a partnership type of relationship between the school jursidiction and its clients, which include parents, students, rate-payers, business, industry, and post-secondary institutions. Inherent in this recommendation is the implied concept of accountability to the public and to interest groups for what goes on in the instructional programs in schools, and for the purpose or goal behind these programs.

Secondly, Alberta Education recognizes the need for school jurisdictions to develop a sense of ownership, or belongingness in the implementation of the policy. Thus the government allows for a degree of discretion at the jurisdictional level. Therefore, while the objectives and content of the curriculum are set by the province, it will be the responsibility of the school jurisdiction to select the most suitable mode and place of learning for their secondary school students, and to ensure that the programs' adequacy will be monitored.

Finally, for successful implementation of new instructional programs, it is imperative that the school system provide the opportunity for collaboration and participation of teachers and administration, as well as adequate guidance, time, resources, and technical assistance, (Purkey and Smith, 1985; Berman and Mclaughlin, 1976; and Fullan, 1982).

Effective schools are an important priority in the Secondary Education Policy Statement. Lamoureux identifies six implications for administrators and professional personnel in the attainment of that goal. First, secondary school personnel must strive to encourage every individual to engage in a variety of instructional programs to complement

the acquisition of skills, attitudes and knowledge with the enhancement of personal interests, aspirations, and abilities.

Second, personnel should encourage a partnership approach to educating individual students. A close relationship should be fostered between the family and the school. Consequently, instructional program selection should be made jointly by the students, their family, and the school's professional staff. The student and the family should clearly be aware of the individual's needs and abilities and the implications of selecting alternative courses.

Third, the students, families, and community should be informed of the behavior, initiative, and achievement expectations of the professional staff in schools.

Fourth, comprehensive guidance and counselling services should be made available to every student to ensure that the individual selects the appropriate course that will permit maximum flexibility for future program choices. Additionally, provisions should be made to facilitate occupational awareness and preparation, as well as for the development of personal, social and learning skills.

Fifth, to further enhance a community partnership and to ensure coordinated and complementary assistance to students, the secondary school system should develop direct and operational linkages with public and private agencies which provide services to Alberta youth.

Finally, accurate information about the abilities and interests of students should be the basis upon which decisions to place students into special programs are made.From the perspective of the student, the policy indicates one essential requirement, and that is for the individuals to assume the responsibility to do their best and to aspire to their own personal excellence in their acquisition of a broad general education. Lamoureux suggests that without this commitment from the student, the central focus of the Policy Statement will be missed.

SUMMARY

This chapter provides an overview of the processes involved in the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education policy. It begins by examining the motivational factors behind the initiation of a comprehensive review of Albert'a secondary education program. Secondly, it gives a chronological account of the review process, culminating in the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education policy statement. The policy formulation process described provides the organizational framework for the detailed analysis of the process in chapter six. Finally, the chapter concludes with a discussion of the content of the policy statement and its implications for the future direction of Alberta's secondary education instructional program.

Chapter 5

PARTICIPATION OF MAJOR STAKEHOLDING GROUPS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the processes involved in the formulation of Alberta's Secondary Education policy. This policy formulation process was of particular significance because it marks the first time in Alberta's history that the government has undertaken such a thorough consulatative approach to policymaking (David King, Former Minister of Education,1986). The government had elected to invite all Albertans to become involved in the formulation of this policy, and attempted to provide opportunities for them to do so. Consequently, as described in the previous chapter, a Minister's Advisory Committee and a Secondary Education Review Project Team were established, charged with the responsibility for conducting a thorough review of the secondary education program in Alberta, as well as with obtaining the views and expectations of all of the major stakeholding groups.

Because of the extremely broad range of participants in the policy formulation process, the study was delimited to six key influential stakeholder groups involved in the policymaking process. These groups included the ATA, ASTA, ACSTA, CASS, AISCA, and the Minister's Advisory Committee.

Freeman (1984:25), in his discussion of a stakeholders approach to strategic management, defines a stakeholder as "...any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the firm's objectives." He advocates the involvement of

stakeholder groups in the formulation of policy,"...as strategic planning is inherently connected with setting some direction for the organization, based on an analysis of organizational capabilities and environmental opportunites and threats" (Freeman,1984:34). Consequently, in public policymaking it is important to develop measures of satisfaction of those stakeholding groups whose support is necessary for the adoption and successful implementation of the policy. Lasswell (1971:52) describes these participants as "...the combination of individuals and groups organized or unorganized, who control the base values required to innovate, maintain, or destroy the system." Thus, it becomes important, as well as strategic to assess the views and expectations of key stakeholder groups to ensure that the proposed policy falls within their zone of acceptability and will consequently merit their continued support. The consultation process may then be viewed as an intelligence gathering mechanism that can assist organizations to predict more accurately the environmental opportunities and threats with which the proposed policy should be prepared to deal.

The purpose of this chapter then, was to examine from the stakeholder's point of view, the extent of their involvement in the formulation of the Secondary Education policy.

THE MINISTER'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

In February 1984, David King, Minister of Education, appointed an eight member Advisory Committee. This Committee was formed with the expressed purpose of assisting the Minister by reviewing submissions and formulating a framework for the future direction of Alberta's secondary education program. The Advisory Committee examined data collected by the Alberta Education Project Team, held public forums to solicit the views and expectations of stakeholder groups across the province, received and reviewed submissions in the form of letters, reports, briefs, and telephone calls from individuals and stakeholding groups throughout Alberta. Through the Secondary Education Review

process, and on the basis of all the data and information gathered, the Advisory Committee provided recommendations for action to improve the content and delivery of secondary education in Alberta (Foundations for the Future, 1984:1).

The Minister in formulating an Advisory Committee selected individuals who were considered by him to be articulate, intelligent, and committed to the process. Additionally, such criteria as the geographic location, occupation and experience, age and sex of the potential members was considered. Thus, the composition of the committee was designed to be largely representative of Albertans. To select candidates for the Committee, the Minister asked for nominations from Members of the Legislative Assembly, and from the major stakeholding groups (David King, Former Minister of Education, 1986). Consequently, the final Committee was comprised of the following individuals:

Halvar C. Jonson, MLA for Ponoka-Chairman

Patrick J. Gorman, Businessman, former School Trustee,GrandPrairie

Arnold McCallum, N.W.T.

Harlene Morsby, Chairperson of Foothills School Division, Turner Valley

Lynn Sawyer, Grade 12 Bachelaureate Student, Edmonton

R. Bryant Targett, Vocational School Principal, Calgary

C. Peter Valentine, Businessman in Petroleum Industry, Calgary

Ronald P. Livermore-Executive Assistant, Consultant, Alberta Education

The Minister's Advisory Committee, with the assistance of the Alberta Education Project Team, was charged with the responsibility of conducting the public consultation part of the Secondary Education Review. The Advisory Committee was to become the

"eyes and ears" of the Minister of Education, and was to provide a broad range of opportunites for the public and stakeholding groups to become involved in the process. Through a Minister's Advisory Committee, acting in a purely advisory capacity, and chaired by an elected official, MLA Halvar Jonson, the Minister hoped to expose Albertans to and educate them in the political dimension of the policy formulation process. Albertans were given the opportunity to see and hear politicans actively involved in the policy formulation process, and for the first time, Albertans were given the opportunity to become actively involved in the process (David King, Former Minister of Education, 1986).

In conducting the Secondary Education Review the Minister's Advisory Committee were provided by, Alberta Education, with the following four key questions as the framework for the review; the Committee's final report; and the basis for submissions to the review:

1) What was the purpose of secondary education?
2) What attitudes, knowledge and skills are required of secondary education students?
3) In what ways can students learn best?
4) What are the roles, rights and responsibilities of all the participants in schooling?
(Foundations for the Future, 1984:4)

The Advisory Committee then formualted eight guiding principals that would provide the foundation for their response to representations made by the public and stakeholder groups, as well they would form the basis for developing recommendations in their report "Foundations for the Future".

The Secondary Education Review process, as described in chapter four, essentially involved two parts: the initial assessment of the views and expectations of the public and stakeholder groups with regard to the present and future direction of the secondary

education program in Alberta; and the response of individual and stakeholder groups to the recommendations made in the Minister's Advisory Committee's report "Foundations for the Future". Although the Advisory Committee was formed after the information brocheure and questionnaire had been developed the Committee had input into other instruments that were designed to measure the general public's opinion on secondary education, such as the Gallup Poll, and the student opionnaire. Additionally, through Alberta Education, and the Alberta Federation of Home and School Association, the Committee advertised public forums for the purpose of identifying concerns and issues that were relevant to the Secondary Education Review. They also made themselves available for a designated period of time for invitations to public and stakeholder group meetings, conferences, and discussions. Written accounts were taken of all presentations made to the Committee. In an attempt to agregate and present accurately all views expressed in a meeting, the Committee held post-forum meetings either informally or formally, in which members would discuss and clarify what they perceived to be major themes brought out in the meeting, and any areas of conflicting views. During this phase of the consultative process 117 written submissions were made in response to the public meetings and the four key questions posed by Alberta Education. These were analyzed by Alberta Education and consolidated into a document entitled "Secondary Programs Review: Summary of Policy Recommendations and Identification of Issues According to Briefs from Groups/Organizations".

The Minister's Advisory Committee analyzed, balanced, and consolidated all of the presentations made during the first part of the Secondary Education Review process, as well as all of the Alberta Education commissioned reports and studies, and reflected those views in their report "Foundations for the Future" in the form of eighty-eight recommendations for the future direction of secondary education in Alberta (Chairman of the Minister's Adivisory Committee,1986).

The second part of the Secondary Education Review process was much more structured. The public and stakeholding groups were invited to discuss and respond to the eighty-eight recommendations in the document prepared by the Minister's Advisory Committee. This was a final opportunity for the Committee to determine how accurately the report reflected the views of Albertans. The Minister's Advisory Committee then went back to their report and based on the responses attained during this phase of the review, made the necessary revisions to "Foundations to the Future" and presented these findings in an unpublished document to the Minister. The Committee's input terminated at this point in the process, and they were no longer consulted until the first draft of the policy document had been constructed by Alberta Education. The Minister's Advisory Committee came to an end in June 1985 with a final meeting to review and discuss the final policy statement.

In conclusion, the Minister's Advisory Committee was a group formed for the expressed purpose of providing the Minister with assistance in assessing the views and expectations of Albertans, and with providing them with an opportunity to become actively involved in the policy formulation process.

ALBERTA TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION (ATA):

The Alberta Teachers' Association is one of the largest and consequently most powerful eduational organizations in the province of Alberta. As a representative of Alberta teachers the ATA must, as part of its mandate, become actively involved in educational issues that have implications for, or repercussions on the teaching profession. Thus, the Secondary Education Review was an issue that warranted the Association's involvement.

The Alberta Teachers' Association, in anticipation of a major review of secondary education, formed an Association Task Force in 1981 to conduct their own investigation into secondary education programs. The Task Force "...received individual and group

submissions, examined existing Association policy, reviewed specialist council positions and studied Canadian and international literature on secondary education. The research culminated in the formulation of the Association's position on secondary school programs in June 1983" (Alberta Teachers' Association Submission on Secondary School Programs in Alberta, 1984:1).

Because of the large membership in the Alberta Teachers' Association and the short time frame that Alberta Education had established for individual and stakeholder submissions to the Secondary Education Review process, the ATA felt that it did not have sufficient time to undertake another in-depth review of the secondary education program that would involve all of the Association members; nor did it have sufficient time to assemble the full ATA Curriculum Committee to deal with the review. Consequently, the ATA established an ad hoc committee called the Committee on Response to the Secondary Education Review. It consisted of the following members of the Curriculum Committee:

D. M. Stanley, chairperson

R. M. Stuart, Secretary

J. E. Anderson, member

M. D. Spackman, member

A. Hrychuk, chairperson of Committee on Education Blueprint

M. J. Williams, secretary of Committee on Education Blueprint

J. R. Weed, president of the Council on School Administration

as well as a Sub-Committee, generally consisting of D. M. Stanley and R. M. Stuart, to prepare and present the Association's position on the Secondary Education Review (ATA Executive Secretary, 1986).

The basic strategy adopted by the ATA Committee was to consult with those members most knowledgable and concerned with curriculum matters, and on the basis of that consultative process and the information gathered by the ATA Task Force in 1981, the Sub-Committee developed submissions for the Minister's Advisory Committee on the secondary education program in Alberta (ATA Executive Secretary, 1986). The Sub-Committee in consultation with specialist councils and ATA local representatives developed two reports for submission. The first report entitled "Alberta Teachers' Association Submission on Secondary School Programs in Alberta," was based in substantial part on reseach undertaken by the Association's Task Force in 1981. Submitted in March 1984, to the Minister's Advisory Committee, the four page document focused on making recommendations in three areas: Junior High Programs, Senior High Programs, and Essential Support Elements for All Secondary Programs.

The second submission on behalf of the Alberta Teachers' Association to the Minister's Advisory Committee was in June 1984, in response to Alberta Education's requests for briefs from individuals and stakeholder groups. This submission focused on the four key questions and issues raised in Alberta Education's paper "Review: Junior and Senior High School Program of Studies" (Alberta Teahcers' Association: Supplementary Submission to The Minister's Advisory Committee on Secondry Education Review, 1984). The ATA's four page brief addressed such issues as setting standards, study habits and problem solving skills, defining competence, understanding our heritage, cooperation and competition, and finally, the purpose of secondary education.

The Alberta Teachers' Association invited Halvar Jonson to its annual summer conference in August 1984, to discuss the Secondary Education Review, and to address the four key questions that formed the basis of the review.

In January 1985, the Minister's Advisory Committee released the report "Foundations for the Future," and invited individuals and stakeholding groups to respond

to the report. During that same month the Alberta Teachers' Association released an information sheet to locals and specialist councils informing them of the ATA's plan to prepare a response to the Minister's Advisory Committee's report. A deadline of March 1, 1985 was set by the Alberta Teachers' Association for local and specialist council participation in the ATA response. On March 28, 1985, in a special meeting with the Minister's Advisory Committee, the ATA presented its response to "Foundations to the Future," in the form of a twently-five page document entitled "The Alberta Teachers' Association Comments on the Review of Secondary Programs Report of the Minister's Advisory Committee". This document was written in draft form by the ATA Committee on Response to the Secondary Education Review, and then submitted to the Table Officers' Committee, where it was discussed and revised. The Alberta Teachers' Association's participation in the policy formulation process culminated with its participation in a public hearing held by the Minister's Advisory Committee in Edmonton on April 1, 1985.

In conclusion, the Alberta Teachers' Association's involvement in the Secondary Education Review process was primarily limited to three written submissions and two special meetings with the Minister's Advisory Committee. Its attempts to involve all of the members of the Association was severely limited by the timeline imposed by Alberta Education for individual and stakeholder participation in the Secondary Education Review process.

ALBERTA SCHOOL TRUSTEES' ASSOCIATION (ASTA):

The Alberta School Trustees' Association can be viewed in Lasswell's terms (1971:52), as an effective participant in the policy formulation process. The Association supports the premise that education is public business and that public involvement should be sought first and foremost in the policy formualtion process. The ASTA views itself as a major stakeholding group in education; thus, any issue that arises that may have possible provinical educational implications requires that the Association become involved. The Secondary School Review was such an issue that warranted the Associations's active involvement and support.

During the 1983-84 school year the Alberta School Trustee's Association established a Task Force on the Secondary Education Review to assist the Association in "...the development of a postion on the future image of secondary schooling in Alberta" (ASTA, 1985:i). The Association's Task Force is organized on the basis of six geographic zones and four metropolitan boards. In order to have equal representation from across the province of Alberta an elected school trustee was selected from each of the ten zones. Additionally, the services of a consultant from the University of Alberta were contracted, and finally, two ASTA staff resource persons were appointed. In conclusion the Task Force consisted of the following representatives:

Mrs. Elaine Jones, Chairman, ASTA Executive

Mrs. Mary Wild, Zone 1

Mrs. Margaret McNary, Zone 2

Mr. Ken Huzil, Zone 3

Mrs. Joan Staldeker, Zone 4

Mrs. Sheila McKinlay, Zone 5

Mrs. Shirley Farr, Zone 6

Mrs. Jean McDonald, Edmonton Catholic

Mrs. Madeleine Payne, Calgary Catholic

Mrs. Rita Dempsey, Calgary Public

Dr. Al Mackay, Consultant, University of Alberta

Mr. Dale Erickson, ASTA Staff Resource

Dr. J. Lawrence Tymko, ASTA Staff Resource

(ASTA,1985:i)

The Task Force adopted a "grassroots" approach to soliciting the views, preferenees, and expectations of School Trustees from across the province of Alberta concerning Alberta's secondary education program. Their approach was built on a framework similar to the one used by Alberta Education in their Secondary Education Review. Consequently, the intent was that the ASTA would be viewing similiar issues and working towards common goals, with Alberta Education.

Because the ASTA shared the goverment's concern for the secondary education program in Alberta, the Association wanted to play a significant role in the final policy document. Therefore, to ensure an influential postion in the review process, the ASTA maintained a high profile with the media and applied pressure at the political and bureaucratic levels in government. Additionally, the ASTA maintained a constant communication linkage with Alberta Education through contact with Mr.Halvar Jonson, chairman of the Minister's Advisory Committee; Dr. Phil Lamoureux, director of Alberta Education's Secondary Education Review Poject Team; and Dr. Rino Bosetti, Deputy Minister of Education. The nature of this communication linkage was to maintain a mutual exchange of current information and findings, and to keep each other abreast of any changes in the direction of the Review process (Tymko, 1986).

In conducting their investigation into Alberta's secondary education program the ASTA examined various documents used by the Minister's Advisory Committee, and engaged in the following activities.

The Task Force began by conducting a major survey of trustee's opinions about a number of aspects of secondary schooling. To facilitate this purpose a questionnaire was developed by the Task Force based on the questionnaire originally used by Alberta Education in their Secondary Education Review. This survey was carried out through a series of Association Zone workshops in early 1984. During these one day workshops the Task Force reviewed the questionnaire in detail and discussed key issues. With this knowledge base the participants were then invited to respond to the questionnaire. During this same period the chairperson of the Task Force, Mrs. Elaine Jones, and Dr. J. L. Tymko met with the Minister's Advisory Committee to discuss preliminary findings of the survey. The final analysis of the data was conducted by University of Alberta consultant, Dr. Al MacKay.

At the annual Red Deer Conference in June 1984, the Task Force invited a number of informative guest speakers including Mr. Halvar Jonson, from the Minister's Advisory Committee, and Dr. Phil Lamoureux, from the Alberta Education Secondary Education Project Team, Dr. Bob Lawson, from the University of Calgary, Mr. Leith Hill, from Alberta Education, and finally, Father Gabriel Ehmon. At the conference the Task Force provided the opportunity for a number of trustees to engage in a discussion of the results of its Trustee Survey, and of the information provided during the conference by the guest speakers.

During March 1985, the Task Force once again attended Association Zone meetings to obtain trustees' views on the principles arising from the 1984 Trustee Survey, and on many of the recommendations contained in the Minister's Advisory Committee's report "Foundations for the Future" (ASTA, 1985:ii).

Through the review process the Task Force also engaged in "...intensive discussions of various aspects of secondary schooling, consulted a large number of stakeholders and experts, and read extensively in the literature on secondary schooling, for

example "A Place Called School" by John Goodlad; "Paidea Proposal" by Mortimer Adler; "Schools of the Future" by Marvin Cetron; "Review of Secondary Programs", Alberta Education; and "Directions", Saskatchewan" (ASTA, 1985:ii).

The Task Force culminated its work with a report entitled "New Directions for Secondary Education in Alberta", which was developed and written in response to the aforementioned activies and as a representation of the Association's perspective regarding the future direction of Alberta's secondary education program.

ALBERTA CATHOLIC SCHOOL TRUSTEES' ASSOCIATION (ACSTA):

The Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Association elected not to become an effective participant in the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy. The Association took the position that there were no urgent areas of concern in the present secondary education program that could not be dealt with through their annual submissions to the government Education Caucus Committee. In addition, the Association essentially was satisfied with the current secondary education program, and that they felt confident that any changes the government would make in the present program would be within the Association's zone of acceptability (R. Laplante, Coordinator for Religious Education; ACSTA, 1986).

Finally, the Association felt that their involvement in other governmental initiatives such as revisions to the School Act, the Management and Finance Plan, and the Committee on Tolerance and Understanding, would result in more significant influence and impact on secondary education in Alberta, than would their participation in the Secondary School Review.

CONFERENCE OF ALBERTA SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS (CASS):

The Conference of Alberta School Superintendents played an active role in the Secondary Education Review process. As an association and as a group of educational leaders in Alberta, CASS felt it had an obligation to become a participant in developing the future direction of secondary education in Alberta. CASS had in the past two to three years prior to the initiation of the Secondary Education Review, requested to the Minister and to Alberta Education that a major review of Alberta's secondary education program be undertaken. The Association identified three specific areas that such a reivew should consider: 1) The role of the adolescent in the Junior High School. CASS felt that research and innovative approaches to dealing with this phase of an individual's life had been developed over recent years, and that these findings could have positive implications for the Junior High School System in Alberta. 2) There was concern over the utility and suitability of the semester system and the Carnegie Unit used in the present secondary education system. 3) Vocational Education was yet another area of concern for the CASS. The declining enrollment in vocational programs was an indication to the Association that perhaps the system was not addressing the interests and needs of students today. Thus, the Conference of Alberta School Superintendents fully supported the Secondary Education Review and encouraged its members to become actively involved in the process.

As an association, the Conference of Alberta School Superintendents adopted a "grassroots" approach to involve its members in assessing and articulating their views and expectations with regard to the secondary education program in Alberta. The intent behind adopting such an approach was to elicit the opinions of those individuals intimately involved with the everyday operation of secondary education systems across Alberta; and who often were the recipients of opinions, concerns and complaints from principals, teachers, students, and parents, regarding the need for change in the secondary education program. Additionally, since superintendents would be instrumental in instituting any

changes in the secondary program as a result of the Secondary Education Review, CASS felt that they should have a voice in the direction and form that these changes might take. By becoming actively involved in the process, CASS believed that the members of the Association would not only have a better understanding of the direction of the outcomes of the review process, but they also would have an opportunity to develop a sense of "ownership" in the formulation of the final policy.

The CASS association is divided into zones, each with an elected representative called a Director. Together these Directors comprised the CASS Education Committee, and were charged with the responsibility for representing the Assocatiation's position in the Secondary Education Review process. Together the Committee discussed and reviewed all of the data and information provided for them by Alberta Education, and elected to respond primarily to the recommendations in the Minister's Advisory Committee's Report "Foundations for the Future". Thus, the Directors returned to their zones and conducted meetings with members to discuss and respond to the eighty-eight recommendations in the report. As each recommendation was discussed in detail, all concerns and opinions were recorded. Directors encouraged zone members to attend and to become actively involved by expressing their opinions or making submissions at the public forum, held in their region by the Minister's Advisory Committee.

The zone Directors returned to the CASS Education Committee meeting with all of the information they had gathered through consultation with the members in their area. As a Committee, the Directors then consolidated the responses of their members, and identified major areas of concern, conflict and consensus within the zones with regard to the eighty-eight recommendations in "Foundations for the Future". Jackie Gee, chairperson of the Education Committee, was selected to write the final reaction paper which reflected the position of CASS with regard to the recommendations in the Minister's Advisory Committee's report. To ensure that the report reflected accurately the position of the

members of the Association, the Directors and the members in their zone discussed, confirmed and revised the document before the final draft was constructed. The final reaction paper "Conference of Alberta School Superintendents' Reaction to Review of Secondary Programs: Foundation for the Future" was submitted to the Minister's Advisory Committee, and forwarded to Alberta Education. The paper then became the basis for discussion at the annual CASS conference in Edmonton, and formed a part of their resolutions.

ALBERTA INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES ASSOCIATION (AISCA):

The Alberta Independent Schools and Colleges Association viewed the initiation of a Secondary Education Reiview as a political decision, made in response to a public perception that there was a need for change in the secondary education system. Because the schools within the AISCA organization continually review their programs in light of what the province and their own school society requires, they did not perceive a real need for a major review. However, the Association's decision to become involved in the process was contingent upon the fact that the Secondary Education Policy would establish the basic philosophy and guiding principles that would shape the future direction of secondary education in Alberta. Thus, AISCA viewed participation in the policy formulation process as an opportunity to influence the value basis for policy decisions, as well as a chance to express the Association's view as to what values should be taught in the various subject areas, and to ensure that the new policy would allow enough flexibility to let schools provide programs which reflect the philosophy in which the school is based, and in a manner that allows the school to maintain its own integrity and identity.

Due to the short time span alloted by Alberta Education for stakeholder participation in the Review process, as well as their previous commitment to numerous other projects and studies that were operating concurrently (ie: Curriculum audit, private

schools investigation) the Alberta Independent Schools and Colleges Association elected to not become directly involved in the Secondary Education Review process, Therefore, it was decided that Christian Schools International would be selected to respond to the Secondary Education Review on behalf of AISCA, as they were intimately involved with the secondary education program (G. Duthler, Executive Secretary, AISCA, 1986).

The mainstream approved Christian Schools have in the past made a conscious effort to steer away from the media and lobby-group tactics to influence policy decisions. Instead, Christian Schools have elected to settle disputes and concerns over educational matters within the context of Alberta Education. The result has been that the Christian Schools and Alberta Education have maintained an open working relationship. Their involvement in the Secondary Education Review followed the normal channels provided by Alberta Education or the Minister's Advisory Committee (B. Koole, Vice-Principal, Edmonton Christian High School, 1986).

Christian Schools International, on behalf of AISCA, contributed to the Secondary Education Review in a number of ways: first, they discussed with teachers, students, and parents the Alberta Education questionnaire that was sent to every Alberta household. As a class assignment, the grade twelve students responded to the questionnaire, and the staff and parents were strongly urged to complete the questionnaire as well as to attend the public forums to ensure that the independent Christian Schools were well represented. Second, John Vanderhoek, Curriculum Corridinator of Christian Schools International, constructed a three page letter in response to an "Open Letter to All Albertans From David King, Minister of Education" (Edmonton Journal, March 12, 1984), in which he invited Albertans to express their opinions concerning the current secondary education program. Vanderhoek's letter addressed seven concepts: 1) the primary roles of education; 2) the structure of the secondary education system; 3) the content of the secondary education curriculum; 4) the role of the adolescent; 5) the role of the non-academic student; 6) school

size; and 7) diploma requiremnets (Christian Schools International, March 27, 1984). Third, the Curriculum Office of Christian Schools International prepared a seven page brief entitled "Response to Minister's Advisory Committee for Review of Secondary Programs". In the preparation of the submissions made to the Minister's Advisory Committee, Christian Schools International attempted to reflect the views of its participants and the philosophical basis of the schools. The document discussed such issues as the needs of adolescents in composite high school programs; the service component of secondary schools; attitudes, knowledge, and skills of secondary education students; and the ways students learn best. The submission was written in consultation with the Edmonton Christian High School Staff Committee, and then passed on to an Education Committee comprised of parents, staff and members of the Christian School Board, where it was discussed, revised and confirmed. Finally, the document was passed to the Christian School Board for final revisions and approval (B. Koole, Vice-Principal of Edmonton Christian High School; A. DeMoor, Curriculum Coordinator for Edmonton Christian Schools; and G. Duthler, Executive Secretary of AISCA, 1986).

In conclusion, the AISCA's (represented by Christian Schools International) involvement in the Secondary Education Review was delimited to two major submissions, as well as participation in the questionnaire and public forums. Additionally, various Members of the Legislative Assembly were invited to Edmonton Christian High School Board Meetings, on an ongoing basis, to receive information as to what the Christian Schools were doing, and to clarify any concerns or misconceptions the MLA's might have aquired.

The AISCA, in recognizing that the final policy document provided the basic principles and direction for secondary education for the province of Alberta, and consequently accommodated a diversity of needs, were essentially in agreement with the policy statement. They were however, disappointed that an independent school perspective

was not included as a member of the Minister's Advisory Committee. Nonetheless, the AISCA's real concern is in the implementation of the policy directives and the review of the curriculm content; for it is this area that is of most threat to the ability of the Independent Christian Schools to maintain their identity and integrity.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter the involvement of six stakeholder groups in the formulation of Alberta's Secondary Education Policy was examined. Such issues as why the group became involved; who were the key members involved in the process; what methods were used to solicit the opinions of their members; and finally, what strategies were adopted in attempting to influence the direction of the final policy document? Based on an analysis of the methods and extent of the involvement of these stakeholder groups the following conclusions can be drawn.

Essentially, the majority of the stakeholding groups examined employed a similar strategy not only to solicit the views and expectations of its members, but to also to influence the final policy. The approach most commonly used was to consult, on a small group basis, with Association members. These sessions served the purpose of informing members of critical issues in secondary education, and of soliciting their opinions and concerns on these issues asa a basis for formulating the Association's position on secondary education in Alberta. Some stakeholder groups developed specific strategies in attempting to influence the policy process, while others elected to respond to opportunites provided by Alberta Education and the Minister's Advisory Committee.

Secondly, the majority of the stakeholding groups interviewed supported the Secondary Education Review initiative, as well as the consultative approach adopted by Alberta Education to encourage public and stakeholder involvement in the policy formulation process. Education is public business, consequently the public should be

involved in determing the future direction of secondary education in Alberta (Tymko,ASTA,1986). Thus, major stakeholding groups, as well as the media encouraged Albertans to become involved in the Secondary Education Review process:

> ...Whether it's a public forum or through attending school board meetings and visits to individual schools, we have to become interested in what's happening in our children's futures. Changes have and will continue to take place and if there is to be input from the public we have to speak now...If we want our input to go beyond a public forum we should be pressuring our trustees for action since part of their mandate is taking our concerns to the department (St. Paul Journal, March 14, 1984).

The major concern expressed by the majority of the stakeholder groups interviewed dealt with the tight timeframe that Alberta Education adopted for the Secondary Education Review process:

> Having to provide responses to the report by the third week in March has precluded meaningful involvement of Association specialist council and local subgroups. The 89 recommendations containced in 'Foundations for the Future' deserve careful and considered debate. Rushing the process to meet legislative deadlines is inappropriate (ATA, Comments on Review of Secondary Programs Report of the Minister's Advisory Committee, 1985:2).

The stakeholder groups interviewed felt that the consultative process adopted for the review was a process new to the public, and one that would take time to introduce, to educate the public as to how to make submissions and to articulate their views.

The assessment of public views was of major concern to the ATA, and of some concern to the other groups interviewed. The major issue was the poor return on the questionnaire. The media reported concern over the formating of the questionnaire, its abundance of information, and the apparent bias in the wording of some questions. Coaldale School Trustee Shirley Farr reported that "...an awful lot [of questionnaires] were in the garbage can, because the response form just looked like another advertisement

item...I'm really worried that the (education) minister won't get a fair cross-sectioin of the public replying" (Lethbridge Herald, March 28, 1984). The Red Deer Advocate (March 21, 1984) headlined "Questions slanted on province's education questionnaire: official". The fact that an opinionnaire of student's views and a Gallup Poll were conducted to further assess the public's views were still not enough to restore the ATA's faith that the public's views were adequately being represented:

> A major concern with respect to the first stage of the secondary education review was the real lack of public involvement. Annnounced in February 1984, the deadline for responding with the questionnaire left little time for considered response. Only 10,000 or so were returned. Although 3,000 selected students in Grades 10 and 12 later participated in an opinionnaire, further views could have been obtained from junior high school students and recent senior high school graduates. It is even difficult to know how much weight should be given to the 1,000 Gallup poll respondents...How well the review procedures employed identified views of the majority of Albertans is debatable"(ATA, Comments on Review of Secondary Programs Report of the Minister's Advisory Committee, 1985:2).

The Alberta Independent Schools and Colleges Association expressed concern with the degree of input the public had had in the policymaking process. They were concerned that the politician's perception may be biased by other than educational considerations, and that the public's perception may be biased by the media. Therefore, the educator's views and influence may be diminished by what appears to be a public view, when indeed the public may not have had a view (Executive Secretary, AISCA, 1986).

Another concern expressed by a number of the stakeholder groups interviewed related to the input of certain interest groups at public forums. The majority of those interviewed felt that the Chamber of Commerce and Manpower oriented groups as well as the Religious and Christian groups exercised a great deal of influence at the public forums by articulating their views at every given opportunity, and perhaps at the expense of the

opportunities for other individuals and less organized groups to express their views effectively. However, representatives of the Alberta Independent Schools and Colleges Association, took exception to these claims. They insisted that they steered away from using any "lobby-group" type tactics, and that it was a "fringe group" of unapproved religious schools that made a nuisance of themselves at the public meetings (Executive Secretary, AISCA, 1986). Thus, the accuracy of public representation once again comes into question.

Thirdly, the establishment of a Minister's Advisory Committee was greeted with mixed response by those stakeholder groups studied. The ATA expressed disappointment in having to address this Committee, chaired by MLA Halvar Jonson, rather than dealing directly with Alberta Education, whom the Association perceives to be the real decision-makers. The ATA viewed the Minister's Advisory Committee and Alberta Education to be mutually exclusive, and in their view this point was only reinforced by the apparent gap between the eighty-eight recommendations made in the Minister's Advisory Committee's report, and the final policy document written by the "higher powers" of Alberta Education (Executive Secretary, ATA, 1986). On the other hand, CASS and the ASTA perceived the Minister's Advisory Committee and Alberta Education as working toward similiar goals. The appointment of MLA Halvar Jonson as chairperson of the Advisory Committee was viewed as a strategic decision, because Mr. Jonson as a political figure, is not only a representation of public views, but he is a familiar figure that may engender a feeling of confidence and support from the general public.

In conclusion, the release of the Minister's Advisory Committee report "Foundations for the Future", while attempting to reflect a balance among the views expressed by the public and stakeholder groups and the recent literature on secondary education, was greeted with mixed reviews. In the second phase of the consultative process of the Secondary Education Review, the report provided a concrete basis from

which individuals and stakeholder groups could respond to in detail. The report resulted in a number of submissions, briefs, letters, and oral presentations. The eighty-eight recommendations made in the Minister's Advisory Committee's report tended to broaden the focus of public and stakeholder opinion. Up until this point in the Review process, public input tended to be narrowly focused on one or two issues and basically oriented to the past or present situation in secondary education, rather than on the future direction of secondary education in Alberta (Chairperson of the Minister's Advisory Committee, 1986).

In retrospect, with the exclusion of the ATA, those stakeholder groups interviewed in this study fully endorsed the policy formulation process adopted for the Secondary Education Review, and advocated that a similiar process be implemented by other government departments in future policy decisions. With practise, they believe Albertans will become knowledgable and articulate participants in the policy formulation process.

Chapter 6

THE POLICY FORMULATION PROCESS IN TERMS OF SIX MODELS

Introduction

The previous chapters in this study have been devoted to explaining and describing the patterns of events that led to the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy. The purpose of this chapter is to explain those patterns of events in terms of the following six theoretical frameworks: the Systems Theory, the Group Theory, the Elite Theory, the Institutional Theory, the Rational Theory, and finally, the Integrated System Model.

SYSTEMS THEORY: POLICY AS SYSTEM OUTPUT

Systems Theory portrays policy as the response of a political system to forces brought to bear upon it from the environment. These external forces, known as inputs usually occur in the form of demands and supports. Inputs are often made by individuals or groups in response to a perceived discrepancy between what they have, and what they want. It is this discrepancy that forms the basis for policy decisions, and for the generation of policy alternatives that bridge the gap between what is and what should be (Amara, 1972:61). Consequently, public policy, from a systems perspective, is viewed as the output, which is the result of a process of transforming demands, supports, and other inputs into guidelines for future discretionary action designed to close the gap between what is and waht should be.

The formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy can be interpreted from a systems perspective. Dye (1981:43) identifies six questions to assist the policy analyst in

applying the systems perspective to a policy formulation process. These six questions provide the basis for the following discussion of the Secondary Education Policy from a systems perspective.

1) What are the significant dimensions in the environment that generate demands upon the political system?

The essential elements in the process of policy formulation are values, goals and attainments. The intiation of a major review of secondary education in Alberta, by Education Minister David King, was in response to a general feeling of dissatisfaction with the present secondary education program. The need for change in the secondary education program had been discussed in educational and political circles since 1977 (Chairman of the Minister's Advisory Committee, 1986). The conference for Alberta School Superintendents made a formal request for a secondary education review in 1981, and during the same year the Alberta Teachers' Association established its own task force to examine secondary education issues. Finally, both post-secondary institutions and the business community expressed concern for the quality of education and for the level of skills that high school students possessed upon graduation. Hence, Albertans were communicating to the government through various channels a need for change in Alberta's secondary education program.

2) What significant characteristics of the political system enabled it to transform demands into public policy and to preserve itself over time?

Under the Canadian Constitution, the province of Alberta has the exclusive responsibility for education. Therefore, "...it is incumbent upon the provincial governments, through their elected representatives to ensure that the content and objectives of education are appropriate to the changing times" (Premier Lougheed, 1985). The Alberta government recognized that although it formulates policy which sets direction and

goals; that real change can occur only with the support and cooperation of teachers, students and parents (Policy Statement, 1985). Therefore, the government adopted a consultative approach to the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy. By soliciting the views and expectations of Albertans and stakeholder groups, the government hoped to nuture an understanding of the need for change and to provide an opportunity for Albertans to be participants in establishing the direction of that change, thereby fostering a sense of ownership in the final plicy (Former Minister of Education, 1986).

To assist the Education Minister in assessing the values, opinions, and expecations of Albertans with regard to Alberta's secondary education program, a Minister's Advisory Committee was appointed, and a Project Team was established to gather information and analyze the results of the review. Consequently, the government provided the opportunity for Albertans to express their demands, and to become actively involved in identifying and defining areas of concern in the secondary education program. This in turn, influenced the shape of the basic goals of secondary education as articulated in the final policy document.

Finally, in the process of converting demands expressed by the environment into public policy, the government created a basic framework for the future direction of secondary education in Alberta, allowing "...ample opportunity for involvement by professional staff, particularily teachers, in determining the way in which goals and program directions are implemented" (Highlights of Secondary Education Policy, Alberta Education, 1985).

Despite the fact that government policy is legally sanctioned, the government recognized in the Secondary Education Policy the need to review the "...purposes, goals, content, and delivery of secondary education...on a regular basis to ensure that innovation and excellence are fostered and that the changing needs of students and society are met" (Principle 8, Policy Statement, 1985:9). Thus in terms of a systems perspective, this statement implies a built- in feedback mechanism whereby new inputs may influence the

quality of the output, and at the same time the quality of the output may provide impetus for new input.

3) How do environmental inputs affect the character of the political system?

In the case of the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy, the government as well as many of the major stakeholder groups, elected to take a grassroots approach to soliciting the views and expectations of Albertans. The demands expressed by Albertans provided indicators to the government of the specific areas of concern held by the majority of Albertans and indicated the direction of educational change that would be within their zone of acceptability. Thus, the inputs from the environment helped to not only establish the direction of educational change, but also to establish the acceptable limits or boudaries within which the policy must fall.

4) How do characteristics of the political system affect the content of public policy?

In the formulation of public policy, politicians administer the processes by which policy disputes are raised, argued, heard, and discussed. Thus, politicians are expected to be explicit about the value premises and implications of policy decisions. In the Secondary Education Review process the government attempted to assess the values prevalent in society today. A questionnaire was sent to all Albertans, an opinionnaire was administered to a sample of Senior High School students, and finally, a Gallup Poll was conducted using a random sample of Alberta citizens. Additionally, opportunites were provided for Albertans to respond in writing, or in person to Alberta Education and to the Minister's Advisory Committee. While all of these forms of input influence policy decisions, it should be noted that the Minister's Advisory Committee, to whom presentations were made, served only in an advisory capacity to the Minister, and that the final policy was in fact written in the office of the Deputy Minister of Education by senior level civil servants. Additionally, this draft was further modified as it passed onto the Education Caucus

Committee, full Caucus, and finally Cabinet. Therefore, because the policy was a synthesis and balance of numerous forms of input, some may feel that there were aspects of the final policy that were never open to debate, and were hence the exclusive decision of those in an authoritative position within the political system.

5) How do environmental inputs affect the content of public policy?

As discussed earlier, individuals and stakeholder groups were all invited to express both formally or informally their demands and opinions concerning secondary education in Alberta. When groups take the time to solicit the views of their members and to write formal submissions they will also take the time to determine if their demands are met by the final policy document. Some will continue to reiterate their unmet demands in the format of annual resolutions, or letters to the Minister. Additionally, since Albertans are the recipients of the new policy, and are expected to respect and comply with it, the policy must fall within their zone of tolerance. Thus, environmental inputs provide the value base and estaablish the parameters of the new policy.

6) How does public policy affect, through feedback, the environment and character of the political system?

The Secondary Education Policy sets a firm direction for change in secondary education. However, while the broad direction is set, the government has made provisions for modifications to occur in the implementation of curriculum changes to take into account "...new information and knowledge, new methods of delivery, and new understanding gained from our experiences as we proceed with implementation of this new policy direction" (Policy Statement, 1985:29).

Thus, as the policy is implemented, the government will have to respond to both positive and negative feedback from the recipients of these changes, and make adjustments accordingly.

In conclusion, the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy can be interpreted from a systems perspective. The process adopted, in its simplest terms, was an attempt to transform the demands (values, opinions, and expectations) expressed by society with regard to secondary education in Alberta, into goals and broad direction for the future of Secondary Education in the province.

GROUP THEORY: POLICY AS GROUP EQUILIBRIUM

Group theory is based on the premise that politics is really the struggle among groups to influence public policy (Dye, 1981). Individuals with common interests and values band together to influence policy decisions by pressing their demands upon the government. The task of the political system is to manage conflict created by competing groups by establishing the rules of the game in the power struggle; arranging compromises in the form of public policy; and enforcing these compromises (Dye, 1981:27). Public policy represents a binding decision to commit the various competing groups to one set of possible alternative actions, and to one set of goals and values, thereby attaining a period of equilibrium among interest groups (Baldridge, 1971:22).

The formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy shows evidence of Group Theory dynamics. Premier Lougheed, in his address to the Canadian Education Association in September 1984, stated "...if you have a good education system, the community at large is more able to survive as an entity - to progress and to grow - providing fine opportunites for our young people" (Policy Statement, 1985:3). Thus, all Albertans were seen as having a stake in the future direction of secondary education in Alberta, and were given the opportunity to become involved in establishing that direction. The following is a discussion of their involvement from a group theory perspective.

In the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy, the Minister of Education, after doing some preliminary research into the need and support for changes in Alberta's

secondary education program, announced the initiation of a major review of the secondary education program. Prior to making this announcement in February 1984, the Minister in consultation with the Deputy Minister of Education, had identified the goals and objectives of the Review, and had elected to adopt a consultative approach to involve Albertans in the policy formulation process. Consequently, the rules of the game were established early in the process. The Minister appointed an Advisory Committee to conduct the secondary education review process, assess the information acquired, and to provide recommendations for action to improve the content and delivery of secondary education in Alberta (Foundations for the Future, 1985:1).

After the announcement of the initiation of a Secondary Education Review, the response from the majority of stakeholder groups was favourable; however, some groups expressed concern that the review would result in nothing more than "fine-tuning" with recommendations for change merely shelved and forgotten (Ken Young, President of ATA, Red Deer Local, Red Deer Advocate, February 10, 1984). Others expressed concern over funding: "Public reviews are great as long as there's financing to put their recommendations through" (Stephen Brown, President of ATA, Calgary Local, Calgary Herald, February 10, 1984).

Thus in the initial stages of the review process the Alberta Teachers' Association applied pressure through the media to ensure that Albertans were aware not only of the cost of the review, but also of the possibility that the review could lead to constructive and concrete action.

Once the Secondary Education Review had been announced, and the mechanisms for conducting the review established, the Minister's Advisory Committee, with the assistance of the Alberta Project Team, set out to assess the public's expectations with regard to secondary education. During the initial stages, the consultative process took many avenues. Alberta Education attained the public's perceptions about the needs of

Alberta secondary schools through a questionnaire, a Gallup Poll, a student questionnaire, and commissiioned academic studies. Further representation was received through meetings with major stakeholding groups, which included the Alberta Teachers's Association, the Alberta School Trustees' Association, the Conference for Alberta School Superintendents, university personnel, and the Committee on Tolerance and Understanding (Foundations for the Future, 1985:1).

In sum, the initial consultative phase of the Secondary Education Review provided for individual and stakeholding group input in an organized and efficient way. Major stakeholder groups met privately with Alberta Education, and the Minister's Advisory Committee. Consequently, little confrontation between the conflicting demands of stakeholder groups occured. Secondly, the input from individuals and interest groups took place in various communities across Alberta, with presentations being made to the Minister's Advisory Committee and the Project Team, rather than directly to the Minister. During the period from January 18, 1984, to March 28, 1984, the media response to the first phase of the Secondary Education Review primarily reflected support for the process, and encouraged Albertan's to participate.

In January 1985, the Minister's Advisory Committee released "Foundations for the Future". The major purpose of the report was to "...respond to the major issues identified during the review process and to present recommendations for future secondary education in Alberta" (Foundations for the Future, 1985:2). The report formed a solid basis for discussion across the province. From a Group Theory perspective, "Foundations for the Future", presented an initial a compromise or balance among the various demands expressed by Albertans, and therefore received a great deal of public debate. Professor Butt, a University of Lethbridge professor commented in the Alberta Report (January 28, 1985) that the Minister's Advisory Committee's report was "...comprehensive, thorough, and small 'c' conservative...an excellent summary of public opinion, but with almost no

vision of the future." He went on to explain that the problem with the report was partly due to the process "...when you attempt to assemble views of a wide and sometimes competing array of interest groups into a cohesive whole, the result is often the lowest common denominator, the things everyone can agree on...something bland and basic."

During the second phase of the review process, the Minister's Advisory Committee invited Albertans to respond to the eighty-eight recommendations made in "Foundations for the Future". This phase of consultation provided the opportunity for the government to once again test Albertan's zone of acceptability, to determine more specifically the kinds of recommendations they deemed acceptable, and to determine the direction of change in the secondary education program that would merit the greatest amount of support.

The response to "Foundations for the Future" was mixed. Major newspapers across the province of Alberta, including the Edmonton Journal, Edmonton Sun, Calgary Herald, Calgary Sun, Red Deer Advocate, Lethbridge Herald, Grand Prairie Herald Tribune, and the Alberta Report, generally reported favourable support for the recommended higher standards for high school graduates, and for a balance between basic and specialized training:

> ...the boom has come and gone, and its again a tough competitive world out there. Not only for Alberta and Canada, but also for individuals- if they want the material rewards which used to come easily. Students recognize that. They want to be equipped to compete. The government obviously recognizes it too, which is why it's stepping in to bring public education back in touch with the reality of the world outside the classroom (Edmonton Sun, June 14, 1985).

However, many Albertans expressed concern over the recommendation in the Minister's Advisory Committee Report for a system of specialized high school diplomas. The public perceived this as an overemphasis on the preparation of students for the workplace. The Calgary Herald reported "...a proposed system of specialized high school diplomas has raised the ire of some Calgary officials, who say it would simply convert

schools into job training centres" (January 12, 1985). Catholic School Trustee John Donnachie suggested that the report was the result of lobbying by the business community and "... that community has too loud a voice in the corridors of education" (Calagry Herald, January 12, 1985). A columnist summarized the Minister's Advisory Committee's report by stating:

> The most disturbing aspect of the government ordered study...is its focus on specialization in education...It may suit some employers, but it is extremely unfair to students...Other aspects of the report are far more appealing...a more rigorous and challening course of studies, and clearly defined and communicated expectations for teachers would be welcomed by most Albertans (Calgary Herald, January 12, 1985).

Finally, perhaps the most publicized criticism over "Foundations for the Future" was in response to the following statement: "The spiritual and moral character of society could be enhanced through school activities such as recitiation of the Lord's Prayer" (Foundations for the Future, 1985:7). The Alberta Report (January 28, 1985) best summarizes the impact of this statement:

> Oddly enough, the first and loudest criticism of this report is aimed at something it didn't recommend: daily recitation in class of the Lord's Prayer. Merely a passing suggestion rather than a formal recommendation...it was nonetheless enough for the disestablishmentarian Edmonton Journal to blazon from its January 12 front page: "School Prayer 'like setting clock back?'". That comment came from Alberta Teachers' Association president Nadene Thomas,...In subsequent stories which dribbled onto Journal pages in the following week, everyone from arch-fundamentalist ministers to Muslim Leaders was dragged in to reinforce the Journal's vehement distaste for any surviving traces of Christianity in public institutions.

Another journalist (Lethbridge Herald, January 19, 1985) in response to public debate over recitation of the Lord's Prayer stated: "It is unfortunate, but many of the educational issues

will be set aside during the public debate over this one contraversial subject", the columnist went on to suggest that "Foundations for the Future recommendations are not written in stone. The public still have an opportunity to react during hearings this spring. They should take advantage of it to help re-direct school or else they should stem the tide of criticism directed at the public education system."

Consequently, the second phase of the Secondary Education Review involved much public debate in response to the recommendations made by the Minister's Advisory Committee. The Alberta Teachers' Association created the most vocal public debate over the recitation of the Lord's Prayer. Other groups expressed concern over the emphasis on specialization and prepartaion for the workplace. These kinds of issues provided the motivational factor for numerous interest groups to make presentations and submissions to the Minister's Advisory Committee in response to its recommendations.

The final policy document reflected the outcome of competing demands and represented the binding decision which would establish equilibrium among the competing groups. It purported to establish a balance amon the needs, wants, and expectations which "...young people, parents and adults..." held for the school system "...now and in the future" (Policy Statement, 1985:3). The document, selected policy alternatives designed to best attain the support and acceptance of Albertans:

> The development of a first class secondary education program is never easy. Each of us has opinions about what our schools should do. In many cases, there is a need to balance opposing views. While many suggest a return to a more traditional approach,others believe with equally strong conviction that a more innovative and more future-looking program is needed. This policy provides a balance. It recognizes that our children require a sophisticated, innovative, and challening education. It also recognizes that a sophisticated education demands a firm foundation of basic knowledge and skills (Policy Statement, 1985:4).

Conclusion

The formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy shows evidence of Group Theory dynamics. The Alberta government established the parameters of the Secondary Review process, as well as the avenues in which individual and stakeholder groups could participate. The data collected and the inputs made showed some evidence of competition among stakeholder groups over specfic issues rather than over the direction of the policy. Although some groups seemed to be aligned behind a more traditional approach to education as opposed to those supporting a more progressive or innovative approach, in general, the majority of the groups interviewed were pleased with the final policy document, and stated that they would continue to petition the government on those areas of concern not addressed by the final policy document, nor attended to in the implementation of the policy and the subsequent review of curriculum content. In conclusion, the Secondary Education Policy represents a binding decision to commit the various competing groups to one set of possible alternative actions, and to one set of goals and values, thereby attaining a period of equilibrium among stakeholder groups (Baldridge, 1971:22).

ELITE THEORY: POLICY AS ELITE PREFERENCE

Dye (1981:1) defines public policy as "...whatever governments choose to do or not to do." This definition lends itself to the Elite theory which views public policy as the "...preferences and values of a governing elite" (Dye, 1981:29). Dye (1981:29) succinctly summarizes the essence of the Elite theory of public policymaking in the following paragraph:

> Elite theory suggests that 'the people' are apathetic and ill-informed about public policy, that elites actually shape mass opinion on policy questions more than masses shape elite opinion. Thus, public policy really turns out to be the preferences of elites. Public officials and administrators merely carry out the policies decided upon by the elite.

> Policies flow 'downward' from elites to masses; they do not arise from mass demands.

The formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy can be interpreted, to a limited degree, in terms of the Elite theory. It is the opinion of many of the Associations interviewed that the Secondary Education Review was the result of an internal, or government initiative, rather than in response to a public demand for change in the current secondary education program. During the early seventies when the Lougheed Government first came into power, the government set as part of its mandate to review and improve Alberta's education system:

> All Albertans know that a high calibre education system has been a top priority of their provincial government...Since the Alberta Legislature adopted a Statement of the Goals of Basic Education for Alberta in 1978, the Alberta government has been reassessing the very subsance of Education (Statement by Premier Lougheed, June 12, 1985).

This statement implies that there may never have been a real need for concern about our present secondary education system, but suggests that like everything else, there is always room for improvement.

A review of secondary education programs is not exclusive to Alberta. Provinces across Canada are witnessing similar reviews of their educational systems. The same is occuring in the United States. Thus, some of those interviewed for this study pondered whether or not the Alberta Secondary Education Review was not just part of a North American trend?

As discussed previously, Elite theory is based on the assumption that people are apathetic and ill-formed about public policy, consequently, elites have significant influence on the shape of public opinion on policy questions (Dye, 1981:29). In the policy formulation process adopted for the Secondary Education Review, the government attempted to correct this deficiency by sending an information brochure and questionnaire

to every household in Alberta to inform the public and to assess its views and opinions with regard to secondary education in Alberta. The information brochure provided Albertans with an account of the purpose of Junior and Senior High School Programs, and in layman's terms described the goals of education and schooling approved by the Government of Alberta in 1978, concluding with the following statement:

> Taken together, these statements on goals and personal characteristics describe the purpose of our schools. It's a tall order to say the least, and many have said that the schools are doing too much. What do you think? (Alberta Education Secondary Programs Review, March 1984).

The brochure went on to provide examples of issues and questions that people had raised concerning Alberta's Secondary Education program. It also described the current secondary education program, explaining the composition and purpose of core subjects and group A and B options. The information package concluded with an historical account, from a sociological perspective, of the evolution of the secondary education program and ended with seven issues for Albertans to consider in planning a secondary education program which meets the needs of students, and prepares them for the challenges in the future (Secondary Program Review Questionnaire, 1984).

From an Elite theory perspective, the government can be viewed as having influenced or shaped public opinion by providing an information base from which Albertans were then expected to form their own opinions, and then fill out an 108 item questionnaire included with the information brochure. Thus, the government, from the outset of the review, had defined the foundations or basis for public input by defining for them what already existed in the secondary education system, and identifing seven issues and questions for them to consider. This process may in turn have delimited the range of alternatives generated in the minds of the public, and thereby shaped the direction of their input or responses. Since only 10,000 of the 856,000 households surveyed responded to

the questionnaire, and since the majority of those respondents were parents (70.9%) and teachers (25%), the response could not be considered to be representative of the views of all Albertans. Additionally, the poor response to the questionnaire may have been an indication that the public did not perceive the current state of secondary education to be an area of urgent concern, or perhaps that the majority of Albertans were indeed apathetic towards public policy issues, and would have rather left these matters to elected officials.

The Alberta Government also invited Albertans to express their concerns and views, and more specifically, with regard to the recommendations made by the Minister's Advisory Committee in their report "Foundations for the Future". The analysis and synthesis of the public opinion gathered ultimately involved a group of appointed officials making judgements as to what opinions and vaules were of most significance, and would most influence the direction of the secondary education program in Alberta.

Finally, despite all of the consultation and recommendations gathered in the Secondary Reivew Process, the final policy document was written in the office of the Deputy Minister by senior civil servants. Thus, a select group of government civil servants made the final decision as to what would be the guiding principles for the future direction of Secondary Education in Alberta. However, further modification may have occured as the policy document passed through the Legislative channels of a majority government. The final policy purported to be a balance among conflicting demands, was greeted favourably by Albertans and viewed by the media as a "back to the basics" policy.

In conclusion, the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy exhibited characteristics of the Elite theory approach to the formualtion of public policy in the following ways: first, it is evident that the government certainly did define the paramenters of the Secondary Education Review, as well as the information basis from which the public could further develop their views. Second, while the government encouraged a two-way flow of communication between the government and the masses, a select group of

government appointed officals then determined which values and opinions would be most influential in the formulation of the final policy document. Finally, the policy statement, based on the apparent values and perceptions of the public, was written by senior civil servants who made the final judgement on the shape of the principles that would become the basis of the Secondary Education Policy.

INSTITUTIONALISM: POLICY AS INSTITUTIONAL OUTPUT

The institutional approach to the formulation of public policy focuses on the potential relationship between the structure of governmental institutions and the content of public policy. Because government institutions are "...really structured patterns of behaviour of individuals and groups" (Dye, 1981:21) and that these structures, or patterns of behaviour persist over time, then it is conceivable to suggest that the individuals within these structures may serve to facilitate or obstruct certain policy outcomes (Dye, 1981:21). In the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy there is little evidence in the data collected to indicate clearly a relationship between the content of the policy and the composition or structure of the Department of Alberta Education. For example, there is little available documentation to explain what transpired after the Minister's Advisory Committee consulted with Albertans to seek their opinion of the eighty-eight recommendations made in the report "Foundations for the Future", and after the Committee's submitted to the Minister of Education, a revised edition of "Foundations for the Future" that was based on this consultative process. These revisions were never made public. Finally, the fact that the final policy statement was written by senior civil servants, may suggest that the composition of the group which prepared the final document could have influenced the content of the policy. Additionally, the fact that the policy was then subject to the approval and revisions by the Minister of Education, the Education Caucus Committee, and the Government Caucus, also implies that ultimately the final policy is "whatever governments

choose to do or not to do" (Dye, 1981:1). However, these concepts are merely conjecture as there is little conclusive evidence in the data collected in this study to support this view.

RATIONALISM: POLICY AS EFFICIENT GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

The process used to formulate the Alberta Secondary Education Policy exhibted characteristics of a rational approach to policymaking. While, as is the case in most policymaking situations, a purely rational approach is often delimited by the knowledge and capacity of the policymakers, as well as by such factors as time and resources. Dye (1981:32) identifies five essential elements in rational policymaking. First, policymakers must identify all of society's value preferences and their relative weights; second, they must be able to generate all of the policy alternatives avaliable; third, they must assess all of the consequences of each policy alternative; fourth, they then calculate the ratio of achieved to sacrificed societal values for each policy alternative; and finally, they select the most efficient polciy alternative.

By examining a chronology of the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy (Appendix A), it is possible to identify steps in the process that are characteristic of a rational approach. To begin with, the essential aim of the Secondary Education Review was to set "...,the direction for improving secondary education" (Policy Statement, 1985:1). Alberta Education identified the following four key questions as the focus of the Secondary Education Review process: 1) What is the purpose of secondary education? 2) What attitudes, knowledge, and skills are required of secondary education students? 3) In what ways can students learn best? 4) What are the roles, rights, and responsibilities of all the participants in schooling? (Foundations for the Future, 1984:4). Additionally, the goals of education and schooling approved by the Government of Alberta in 1978, also provided the framework for the generation of policy alternatives. Consequently, the principles of the final policy document had to be consistent with following statement:

> The aim of education is to develop the knowledge, the skills and the positive attitudes of individuals, so that they wll be self-confident, capable and committed to setting goals, making informed choices and acting in ways that will improve their own lives and the life of their community (Policy Statement, 1985:7).

Thus, from the outset of the Secondary Education Review process, the Premier, the Minister of Education, and Alberta Education had clearly articulated the purpose and goals of the Review process, thereby determining the steps to be taken in formulating the Secondary Education Policy.

The second step in the rational approach to the formulation of policy is to establish "...a complete inventory of other values and of resources with weights" (Dye, 1981:33). Alberta Education began the Secondary Education Review process with an assessment of the public's perception of the need for change in the current secondary education program, through a questionnaire, Gallup Poll, and an opinionnaire. During this consultative process Alberta Education also to obtained an indication of the public's and stakeholder's support for change, what they appear to value in education, and their zone of tolerance in the direction and extent of change in the present system. While it may be argued that the goals of education represent what the government believed to be societal values, the process could not be said to have identified all of society's values and their relative weights.

The third step in the rational model (figure 4) involves the preparation of a complete set of alternative policies. In determining a possible set of policy alternatives Alberta Education engaged in a number of endeavors. First, it asked the public and stakeholder groups to submit their views with regard to the future of secondary education in Alberta, and the four key questions were provided as guidelines for making their submissions. Second, Alberta Education commissioned a number of academic reports on issues relevant to the aim and purpose of the Secondary Education Review. Finally, it commissioned a

workshop on "Educational Implications of Images of the Future" (Alberta Secondary Education Program Reivew: Research Basis, 1984:27), from which twelve position papers were generated, all discussing possible images of the future of Alberta and secondary education. On the basis of this workshop and the postion papers generated, Alberta Education was able to articulate "A Vision for a Desirable Future", where they identified ten major characteristics of a desirable future, and accompanying examples of knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for living in that future (Alberta Secondary Education Review: Research Basis, 1984:32-33).

In Alberta Education's preparation of a final set of policy alternatives, the Minister's Advisory Committee was given the task of providing a framework for change and improvemnet in secondary education. The Advisory Committee, after reviewing and synthesizing all of the data gathered in the first part of the review, generated a report which included eighty-eight recommendations. The public was then invited to respond to the recommendations made in the report. Their response gave further indication of the feasibility of the recommendations, as well as of the public's zone of tolerance with regard to possible changes in the secondary education program. The Minister's Advisory Committee submitted to the Minister of Education a revised edition of its initial report, based on the public's response.

From the data collected in this study, and the government documentation available, it is unclear as to the degree to which Alberta Education followed the final three steps of the rational model of policymaking (figure 4). However, it is clear from the initial response to the final policy statement, that it did indeed fall within the zone of acceptability of Albertan's, and it does attempt to provide a balance between a traditional and a more future oriented approach to secondary education.

In conclusion, the policy formulation process adopted in the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy clearly demonstrates characteristics of a rational approach to policymaking.

AN INTEGRATED SYSTEM FRAMEWORK

The system framework (figure 5), as described in chapter two, is essentially a combination of various dimensions of the rational model and the systems theory. It integrates policy planning with policymaking, whereby policy alternatives are selected to best accomodate the present values, goals, and attainments of society, as well as the future societal conditions that it may be instrumental in producing. In sum, the system framework describes the process of converting societal inputs into policies which more efficiently reduce the mismatch between what society wants and what it perceives to have.

The process of formulating the Secondary Education Policy reflected this integrated approach to policymaking. Because both the systems theory and the rational model have already been descibed in detail in this chapter, the integrated approach will be discussed briefly.

Both Dunn (1981) and Amara (1972), suggest that policymaking begins with a perceived or "felt existence" of a problemmatic situation where in a mismatch exists between the system's level of attainment and its goals. The initiation of the Secondary Education Review can be viewed from this perspective. The Alberta Government claims that there was a feeling of dissatisfaction expressed by Albertans with regard to the secondary education system. The Alberta Government, in response to this perceived need for change, engaged Alberta Education in a process of reviewing the secondary education program in Alberta, and eventually in developing a policy statement that would provide the direction and framework to improve secondary education program in the province. Consequently, Alberta Education formulated a plan or strategy to fulfill this task by

engaging Albertans in the process of identifying the relevant issues in secondary education, defining the problems, and determining the extent of the perceived discrepany between what the secondary education program is achieving or attaining, and what, in the eyes of Albertans, it should be attaining. This consultative process provided the essential information basis from which the policy was formed. The following chronology is a summary of the intergrative policy planning and policy making approach used in the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy.

INTEGRATED SYSTEM FRAMEWORK FOR THE FORMULATION OF THE ALBERTA SECONDARY EDUCATION POLICY

THE SOCIAL SYSTEM

PROCESSING VALUES

1. Alberta Education began with an assessment of the values and attitudes of Albertans with regard to secondary education in Alberta now and for the future.

1.1 The instruments used in the assessment of values and attitudes of Poll, opinionnaire, briefs, letters,andtelephone calls from individuals and stakeholding groups.

IDENTIFYING GOALS AND NEEDS

2. Through the instruments used to assess the public's view with regard to secondary education, four summary reports were generated on the following:

a) "Summary of Policy Recommendations and Issues Identified In Briefs From Groups/Organizations" (M. W. Lloyd, June 1984).

b) "The Opinions of Secondary Students Regarding Objectives of Secondary Education in Alberta" (L. R. Tolman, June 1984).

c) The response of Albertans with regard to the goals, content, and process of secondary

education schooling in Alberta. ("The Response of Albertans to The Secondary Program Review Questionnaire" N. McEwen, June 1984).

d) A Gallup Poll of Albertans concerning their attitudes toward the following areas: school attendance, student achievement, operations of private schools, administration, and curricula (Canadian Gallup Poll Ltd., 1984).

2.2 Alberta Education commissioned four studies addressing issues relevant to secondary education:"Educational Developments, Societal Conditions and the Secondary School Curriculum in Alberta, An Historical Overview" (Dr. Sheehan, University of Calgary); "The Alberta Secondary Student: Some Growth Profiles" (Dr. J. Mitchell, University of Alberta); "Pioneering the Future: Educational Implications and Policy Decisions for Alberta Secondary Schools" (Dr. R. Butt, University of Lethbridge).

2.3 These reports, along with a workshop on Educational Implications of Images of the Future, assisted in clarifying the present situation of Secondary Education in Alberta and the world. It drew attention to specific areas of concern, helped to articulate a vision for a desirable future, identified major characteristics of this desirable future, and finally, developed examples of knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for living in this future. On the basis of this input the basic aim of the final policy was clarified. Thus, Alberta Education had an indication of what the public and stakeholder groups perceived to be the problems with the present Secondary Education program, and the kinds of goals that the new policy should attain.

SERVICES AND ATTAINMENTS

3. Prior to the initiation of the Secondary Education Review, Alberta Education launched comprehensive evaluation policy involving Provincally controlled Diploma Examinations, and a teacher, student, school, system, and program evaluation megapolicy. On the basis of the outcomes of these evaluation policies and other ongoing reviews, as well as on the basis of the data collected during the inital phases of the

during the inital phases of the Alberta Education Review, Alberta Education had a fairly accurate analysis of the present state of Secondary Education in Alberta.

INPUT

DISCREPANCIES

4. Alberta Education, with the assistance of the project team, analyzed, and synthesized all of the data gathered to determine the following information and in so doing: a identified the problems and issues in secondary education in Alberta; b) created a vision of a desirable future; c) gained an indication of the valuesand attitudes of Albertans with regard to secondary education; d) assessed the present state of secondary education in Alberta; e) established the goals and aims of secondary education for the future; f) gained an indication of the direction and extent of change most supported and accepted by Albertans.

4.1 The task for Alberta Education was the demands and supports articulated in the Secondary Education Review process into policy alternatives that would best reduce the discrepancy between the system's level of attainment and its future goals and needs.

CONVERSION PROCESS

POLICY PLANNING

5. A Minister's Advisory Committee was appointed by the Minister of Education to "...provide recommendations for action to improve the content and delivery of secondary education in Alberta" (Foundation for the Future,1984).

5.1 The report "Foundations for the Future" was released,and the public was invited to respond to the recommendations made in the report, through a series of public forums, written submissions and telephone calls. This consultative process

provided the Advisory Committee with an indication of the possible consequences of the recommedations, their acceptability, and feasibility.

5.2 On the basis of the input from the public and stakeholder groups, the Minister's Advisory Committee reviewed and revised their recommendations, and submitted this revised edition to the Minister of Education, as one source of viable policy alternatives. Dr. Phil Lamoureux, on behalf of the Project Team, and Dr. George Bevan, Director of Curriculum for Alberta Education also submitted reports dealing with a possible framework for the Secondary Education Policy.

6. In generating the final policy statement, Alberta Education formulated three guiding questions:
i) What changes in the present education system have to bemade to assist education to meet the needs identified?
ii) What structures must be put in place to facilitate meeting the needs identified?
iii) Do the outcomes of questions one and two fall within the value framework of society? (Deputy Minister of Education, 1986).Additionally, the final policy alternatives had to be consistent with the what the futures studies predicted; with the identified views and expectations of Albertans; and finally, with the pedogogical views of education.

6.1 The final policy statement, written by Alberta Education was then submitted for revision and approval to the Minister of Education, the Education Caucus Committee, and finally, the Government Caucus.

OUTPUT

THE POLICY

7. The Government of Alberta released the "Alberta Secondary Education Policy".

Conclusion

The dynamics involved in the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy cannot be fully explained or understood from the perspective of a single theoretical framework. Rather, each of the six theoretical frameworks discussed in this chapter reveals yet another dimension or perspective of the policymaking process. While the process adopted in the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy most clearly demonstrates a systems approach to policymaking, there are still implicit in the process, elements of the elite, rational and institutional models. Because Alberta Education adopted a consultatory approach to conducting the Secondary Education Review and formulating the policy, group theory enhances our understanding of the dynamics involved in the participation of individuals and stakeholding groups.

While the Secondary Education Policy is still in the implementation stage, it will be interesting to determine if the consultative approach adopted in the formulation of the policy did indeed foster a better understanding and acceptance of the policy by Albertans and the major stakeholding groups; if it did change the perceptions and attitudes of Albertans toward the secondary education program; and finally, if it will influence and encourage Albertans to become actively involved in future Government policy endeavors?

Chapter 7

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain the pattern of events that led to the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy (June, 1985) in terms of six theoretical frameworks. Achieving a comprehensive understanding of the policymaking process adopted often depends on the ability of the policy analyst to see how different aspects of the policy formulation process may coexist in a complementary or even paradoxical way (Morgan, 1986:13). Consequently, models of policymaking were abstracted from the literature and used to analyze the public policymaking process. Each model provides a particular focus, and can enhance understanding of different dimensions of the policy formulation process.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a concise review of the study as reported in the previous chapters. The review is organized into three sections. The first provides an outline of the study with reference to the problem statement, research questions and methodology adopted. The second section discusses the findings and conclusions of the study. The final section deals with implications of the study for future policymaking situations as well as recommendations for future research in this area.

OUTLINE OF STUDY

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The general purpose of this study was to examine the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy. The intent was to make explicit what actually took place in a retrospective sense, as it is necessary to know and to understand the past to gain a perspective on the present and future direction of policymaking in Alberta. Because a consultative process was adopted by Alberta Education in the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy, the study focused on the participation of six major stakeholder groups: The Alberta Teachers' Association, The Alberta School Trustees' Association, The Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Association, The Conference of Alberta School Superintendents, The Alberta Independent Schools and Colleges Association , as well as on the role of the Minister's Advisory Committee.

The formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy was critically analyzed from multiple perspectives using the following six theoretical models: the Systems Model, the Rational Model, the Institutional Model, the Group Theory Model, the Elite Model, and finally, the Integrated Systems Model.

METHODOLOGY

A case study approach from an historical perspective was adopted to examine this one particular example of policymaking in Alberta. The case study was carried out in essentially two stages: the first stage was the development of a descriptive chronology of the time period from February 1984, when the Minister of Education initiated a review of Alberta's secondary education programs, to June 1985, when the Premier and the Minister of Education officially announced the Secondary Education Policy. During the second stage the chronology served as an organizing framework for the actual analysis of the policymaking process.

STAGE ONE: CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

A chronology of the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy was derived essentially from primary source documents which comprised mainly of news releases, reports, studies, letters, and briefs contained in the files of Alberta Education, the Alberta Teachers' Association, the Albeta School Trustees' Association, and the Conference of Alberta School Superintendents. Additionally, numerous newspaper articles and editorials pertaining to the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy, written in Alberta daily and weekly newspapers during the period from January 1984, to June 1985, were collected and reviewed. To further supplement and validate the data collected, interviews were conducted with significant actors from each of the five major stakeholder groups identified, as well as with the Minister of Education, David King, the Deputy Minister of Education, Rino Bosetti, the chairman of the Minister's Advisory Committee, Halvar Jonson, and the Director of the Project Team, Phil Lamoureux.

In sum, a comprehensive review of the processes involved in the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy was the result of a synthesis of documents which contributed information and historical data, as well as information attained through interviews with relevant actors familiar with, and knowledgable in the phase in the process under investigation. The chronology of the policymaking process was then validated by submitting it to individuals selected on the basis of their position of authority and familiarity with the process. They reviewed the chronology for its accuracy in terms of the time line, sequencing of events, and content. The chronology provided the data base for the detailed analysis of the policymaking process.

STAGE II: THE ANALYSIS

The analysis of the processes involved in the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy revolved around the application of the six theoretical models described in

chapter two: the Systems model, the Rational model, the Institutional model, the Group theory model, the Elite model, and finally, the Integrated Systems model.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study, in examining the processes involved in the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy utilized essentially five research questions to guide data collection. Throughout the various chapters in this study the various questions have been addressed where applicable. By way of summarizing the substance of this study the following section is devoted to a brief discussion of those research questions posed in chapter one.

1. What were the processes implemented by Alberta Education in the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy?

A description and explanation of the processes involved in the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy are contingent upon the perspective or theoretical framework adopoted by the policy analyst. In a descriptive sense, the basic approach adopted by Alberta Education in the formulation of this particular policy was the consultative approach, wherein Alberta Education made a deliberate effort to involve Albertans in the identification and clarification of the problems in the present secondary education program in Alberta. The views, expectations, and preferences expressed by Albertans were used as the value base from which policy alternatives concerning the goals and future direction of secondary education in Alberta were generated. The following table provides a summary of the processes implemented by Alberta Education in the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy.

Table 2
The Political Dimension of the Consultative Process Employed in the Secondary Education Review

PUBLIC	EXPERTISE	QUASI POLITICAL	PURE POLTICAL
.Opinionnaire .Survey .Gallup Poll .Public Forums .Written . Submissions	.Project Team .Commissioned . Reports .Alberta Education	.Minister's Advisory Committee	.Minister of Education .Caucus

2. What were the significant issues perceived by the various actors in the environment that generated a need for the development of the Secondary Education Policy?

The various actors interviewed in this study perceived seven issues (Appendix A) to be instrumental in generating the need for the initiation of the Secondary Education Review, and the consequent development of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy. The most significant factor identified by the majority of the actors was Premier Lougheed's determination to make education a top government priority. Since 1978, when the Alberta Government adopted a statement of the Goals of Basic Education for Alberta, the Alberta government had been addressing the very substance of education (Premier Lougheed, 1985). The other factors perceived to be influential in generating the need for change in the secondary education program included the following: 1) a perceived feeling of discontent with and a lack of confidence in the secondary education system expressed by Albertans; 2) the need to create an educational system organized to prepare students to become contributing citizens in the current and the twenty first century; 3) the fact that since the 1970's the secondary education system had gone through numerous piecemeal changes,

and a comprehensive review was long overdue; 4) there was a perceived shift in emphasis in today's competitive world from input factors to quality and accountability for system output, thus the educational system had to become more results oriented; 5) the need to bring the educational community back together again in a cooperative effort to improve secondary education; 6) the need to establish a reliable structure for secondary education in which all participants know and understand how and why it works, and are cognizant of its established guidelines and boundaries.

In conclusion, the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy was in response to a combination of factors that had become of increasing concern in the environment over a period of time.

3. To what extent did Alberta Education use a consultative approach in the policy formulation process?

3.1 At what points in the policy formulation process were the major stakeholding groups consulted?

3.2 What role in the policy formulation process did the following stakeholding groups play?

a. Alberta Teachers' Association
b. Alberta School Trustees' Association
c. Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Association
d. Alberta Indepentdent Schools and Colleges Association
e. Conference for Alberta School Superintendents
f. Minister's Advisory Committee
g. Alberta Education

In general Alberta Education used the consultative approach during the initial phase of the Secondary Education Review to assess the values, opinions, and expectations of Albertans. The purpose of this consultative process essentially was to determine what was to be the value base and the basic aim of the Secondary Education Policy. Dr. Bosetti (1986), Deputy Minister of Education, identified three additional objectives in adopting a consultative approach:

1. To increase the knowledge and understanding of Albertans with regard to the present and future direction of secondary education in Alberta.
2. To test and expand the zone of tolerance of Albertans with regard to secondary education.
3. To enhance commitment to the adoption and implementation of the Secondary Education Policy, by developing a sense of ownership in the formulation process.

Thus, Albertans were consulted in the initial phase of the Secondary Review process through their participation in a questionnaire, opinionnaire, Gallup Poll, public forums, and through the submission of letters, reports, and briefs. Some of the major stakeholder groups elected to become involved in this initial phase mainly through the submission of briefs (ATA, AISCA), while others waited until the second phase to submit their views.

During the second phase of the Secondary Review process, the Minister's Advisory Committe released the report "Foundations for the Future," which was a synthesis of all of the data gathered during the initial phase of the review. Albertans were once again asked to respond to recommendations made in this report through written submissions, or through participation in public forums held by the Minister's Advisory Committee. All of the stakeholder groups, with the exception of the Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Assocation, made submissions in response to "Foundations for the Future". On the basis of the information gathered during this second phase of consultation, the Minister's Advisory Committee reviewed and revised the recommendations it had made in "Foundations for the Future".

The consultative process adopted by Alberta Education concluded with the generation of three documents addressing viable policy alternatives for the Alberta

Secondary Education Policy. The final selection of those alternatives, and the writing of the final policy statement was conducted by senior civil servants in the office of the Deputy Minister of Education.

In conclusion, the consultative process, and the participation of the major stakeholder groups in that process resulted in the formulation of the value basis, the boundaries, and the possible goals and directions of the Secondary Education Policy.

4. What individuals or groups influenced or attempted to influence the formulation of the policy?

4.1 What were their motives for becoming involved in the policy formulation process?

4.2 What mechanisms or processes were used by the individuals or groups to bring their views and demands to bear upon the policy formulation process?

4.3 What aspects of the process obstructed or facilitated the individual's or group's attempts to influence the policy formulation process?

4.4 To whom did these individuals or groups submit or otherwise communicate their views and demands with regard to the policy formulation process?

The participation of the six major stakeholder groups is described in detail in chapter five. Each group elected to become involved in the policy forulation process with the intent of having their views and expectations with regard to the secondary education program heard, and hopefully to have their interests addressed in the final poiicy statement.

Because Alberta Education provided explicit opportunities and channels for participation in the policy formulation process, the majority of groups simply used those channels provided rather than embark on lobbying campaigns. Their view was that in this

situation such tactics were not necessary because the government was open and willing to listen. The only obstacle identified by the stakeholding groups was the tight time framework alloted by Alberta Education for the participation of stakeholding groups. Thus, time constraints delimited the extent and depth of involvement for some of the groups.

Finally, during the consultative process, individuals and stakeholder groups communicated their views and expectations to the Minister's Advisory Committee or the Project Team, by sending copies of their submissions to the Minister of Education. Thus, the majority of the stakeholding groups attempted to influence the policy formulation process through both bureaucratic and political channels.

5. To what extent were elements of the following models reflected in the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy?

The formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy is analyzed from the perspective of each of the aforementioned models in chapter six of this study. The following is a brief discussion of that analysis.

Systems Theory

The systems theory perspective was most benefical in the analysis and explanation of the process by which the needs and demands articulated by Albertans during the Secondary Education Review were converted into the Alberta Secondary Education Policy. The utility of the systems model is that it draws the educational policymaker's attention to the concept that our educational system is an open system, and therefore it is necessary to consider the environmental conditions that may serve to affect the direction of policy. Because educational policy is public policy, thus having a pervasive effect on society, it is important that the policy is rooted in the value framework of society. Consequently, by providing

specfic channels in which individuals and stakeholding groups may express their opinions, preferences, and concerns, the policymaker in turn has access to information with regard to the potential impact the enviroment may have on policy decisions, and the zone of tolerance within society with regard to the direction of educational change. By providing opportunities for individual and stakeholder groups to be involved in the policy formulation process an understanding and sense of ownership in the final policy is nutured. Finally, the systems model draws attention to the need for continual feedback and evaluation of the policymaking process, and to public perceptions of the quality and effectiveness of the policy output.

In conclusion, the utility of the systems theory approach to the forumlation of the Secondary Education Policy is that it assisted in the explanation of the processes by which formal and informal groups attempted to have their needs, values, and preferences attended to in the final policy, which inturn resulted in a system of compromises and tradeoffs, as the government attempted to create a policy that best reduced the mismatch between the goals and attainments of secondary education in Alberta.

Elite Theory

Elite theory is based on the premise that public policy is "...whatever governments choose to do or not to do" (Dye, 1981:1). It assumes that because the masses are essentially apathetic and uninformed about public policy, that policy decisions generally result in the "...preferences and values of a governing elite" (Dye, 1981:29).

While the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy exhibited characteristics of the elite theory, it also made an attempt to overcome an elitist approach by consciously seeking public input into the process. They began by attempting to inform the public about the present state of secondary education in Alberta, and to draw their attention to the critical issues facing education. They then provided explicit opportunities for

Albertans to become involved, to express their opinions, expectations, and preferences with regard to secondary education in Alberta. Bosetti (1973), emphasized the need for public involvement when he stated "...there is a necessity to maintain a system monitoring capability which provides a quasi-independent and rational input into the policymaking process...if policymaking is to be open to influence from the external environment, and not entirely subject to influence only from the political elites who may normally articluate demands and supports within the system."

In examining the policy formulation process adopted for the Alberta Secondary Education Policy, it is evident that while Alberta Education encouraged and provided opportunities for Albertans to become involved in the policymaking process, that Albertans still needed more guidance and experience in how to become involved, how to write submissions, and essentially, how to articulate effectively their views, preferences, and expectations. Until Albertans can effectively accomplish this there may never be a true partnership between the government and Albertans in policymaking. Perhaps the best that can be achieved is a junior partnership on behalf of the stakeholding groups, with the government maintaining a senior position.

Institutional Output

In the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy there is little evidence to indicate that a relationship exists between the structure and composition of Alberta Education, the policymakers, and the content of the final policy document. The institutional model, while not directly applicable given the data collected in this study, is a useful concept, as it draws the policy analyst's attention to the possiblity that individuals within the structure of Alberta Education may indeed have the power to obstruct or facilitate certain policy decisions. This revelation also may have implications for those individuals and stakeholding groups trying to attain a position of leverage in influencing policy

decisions. It might be in their best interests to identify individuals within the bureaucratic structure who might be instrumental in facilitating their needs and demands, or individuals who might be instumental in blocking their input. Thus, given that Alberta Education adopted a consultative approach to the formultation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy, it could prove interesting to review the implications of the institutional model and its relationship to the acceptance and implementation of the final policy document. How closely did the policy reflect the preferences and values of the governing elite?

Group Theory

The dynamics of group theory are relevant to the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy in so much as individual and stakeholding groups participated in the policymaking process with the intent of articulating their values, preferences, and expectations with regard to secondary education in Alberta, and consequently influencing policy decisions to some degree. However, because Alberta Education carefully developed a strategy for the formulation of the policy, input was controlled in a rational and efficient way. Alberta Education combined the formulation of the policy with a review of secondary education programs. Thus they began by defining present attainments, and then identified four key questions to guide the review process. Secondly, Alberta Education provided explicit channels and opportunities for individual and interest group input, and thirdly, the Minister of Education established an Advisory Committee to synthesize all of the data collected into a potential framework for a Secondary Education Policy, which was then opened to the response and criticism of Albertans. Consequently, in the eyes of the majority of the stakeholding groups interviewed, there proved to be little necessity to develop strategies to influence policy decisions beyond the opportunities and channels already provided by Alberta Education. Thus, there was little evidence in the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy of open conflict or coalition building between interest groups competing

to influence the policy decision. While it must be recognized that there were conflicting views and demands articulated by the various interest groups, the process employed in policy formulation managed the conflicts and succeeded in striking a balance between conflicting demands.

Rational Model

Considering such factors as mans's limited rational ability, time constraints and the availability of resources, the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy benefited from a relatively rational approach to policymaking. From the outset, Alberta Education formulated a comprehensive strategy to developing the Secondary Education Policy, which incorporated both policy planning and policymaking functions. Alberta Education articulated the purpose and goals of the process adopted. It began with a review of Alberta's secondary education programs; assessed the values, preferences, and expectations of society; determined the direction and range of change deemed acceptable by Albertans; constructed a vision of a desirable future, and identified the attitudes, skills, and knowledge necessary for living in that future; it solicited policy alternatives from the public, professional, and academic factions of society; it synthesized and attempted to create a document reflecting the values and preferences of society, and then asked society to respond to that document; it then, based on all of the data generated, selected those policy alternatives that best accomodated the criteria Alberta Education had previously determined.

Thus, the utility of the rational approach to policymaking is that it provides a logical and structured approach to selecting the most appropriate policy alternatives.

Integrated Systems Model

The integrated systems model is a combination of a systems and a rational approach to policymaking. It combines policy planning with policymaking, thereby logically and

methodically arriving at policy decisions that best accomodate the present values, goals, and attainments of society, as well as the future societal condition that it may be instumental in producing.

The utility of the integrated systems framework is that it clearly indicates what steps are involved in planning an optimal policy. It suggests that the policymaker must first address the social system to determine its values, because these values provide the foundations upon which their views, preferences, and expectations are based. When viewing the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy it is evident that this was what Alberta Education attempted to accomplish in its policy formulation process. From the analysis of the social system, the integrated systems model suggests that the policymaker can determine the prevalent values, identify the goals and needs, assess available services, and the extent of attainments with regard to secondary education in Alberta. In essence, this preliminary process provides the policymaker with an indication of the needs, values, and expectations of significant stakeholders in the environment that will affect and consequently be affected by the final policy statement. These demands and supports identified in the environment are then translated into inputs to the policymaking process. These inputs become the basis from which policy alternatives are generated.

During the conversion process, where policy alternatives are generated to negate the mismatch between the system's goals and attainments, the integrated model identifies twelve steps dealing with the selection and evaluation of these atlernatives. In the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy the policymakers appeared to attend to many of the steps identified. For example, the goals and values of Albertans were identified and the discrepancy between the two were considered during the Secondary Education Review process. Policy alternatives in the form of the Minister's Advisory Committee's report "Foundations for the Future" were released to the public for criticism and response. While the precise processes involved in the selection of the final policy

alternatives are not clear, it is known that the alternatives were selected using the following criteria: that those policy alternatives selected must be consistent with what the future studies predicted, with the identified views and expectations of Albertans, with what is sound pedagogically, and whether the alternatives selected will effect the intellectual development of children and provide them with the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary for the future. Finally, the selected alternatives must be feasible within the existing system of education in Alberta (Deputy Minister of Education, 1986).

In conclusion, the integrated systems framework provides a useful model for policymakers considering a consultative approach to policymaking. Its strength lies in its attention to the preliminary analysis of the social system, to its rational approach to planning policy decisions, which is embedded in the value framework of society.

IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain the processes involved in the formulation of the Alberta Secondary Education Policy. By taking a single example of a policymaking process and applying it to a number of theoretical frameworks various dimensions of the process are highlighted, thereby contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of the total process and perhaps implying its applicability to future policymaking situations.

The formulation of the Secondary Education Policy was a unique process in which the government elected to go to the people and solicit their views, preferences, and expectations with regard to secondary education. Thus, people were directly invited to express their opinions, and concrete opportunites were provided for them to do so. Therefore, members of large associations could contribute independently of their associations, Parents, students and community members could all have a voice in the policy formulation process if they so desired.

The policy formulation process adopted by Alberta Education may have implications for future policymaking situations, as the consultative approach adopted is a departure from methods normally employed in the past. Seldom have Albertans been given explicit opportunites to become so directly involved in the formulation of public policy. Because this approach is relatively new much can be learned from a detailed study of policymaking situations which use this approach.

The main objectives identified by the Minister and Deputy Minister of Education (1986) in adopting a consultative approach to policymaking included the following:

> 1) To increase Albertans' knowledge and understanding of the critical issues in education, and of the policymaking process by which government attempts to resolve those problems.
>
> 2) To test and expand the zone of tolerance or acceptablity of Albertans with regard to changes in Secondary Education.
>
> 3) To nuture a sense of commitment to, and ownership in the Secondary Education Policy.

Finally, the whole consultative process adopted by Alberta Education reinforces their concept of "Partners in Education", which views education as a shared responsibility among parents, educators and the community. Therefore, Albertans must become knowledgable participants in the formulation of a policy that provides the foundations for the future direction of secondary education in Alberta. Thus, given that these kinds of objectives provided the rationale for adopting a consulatative approach to the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy, the following conclusions and implications can be drawn.

It has been said that although the provincial legislature determines the path of education by virtue of the fact it represents the formal policymaking mechanism, that path often is shaped through the influences exerted by major stakeholding and interest groups.

The formulation of the Secondary Education Policy can be viewed as attempting not only to encourage the input of individual and stakeholding groups, but also to control it by providing explicit channels and opportunities for such input. There are a number of advantages in adopting such an approach. First, by providing explicit opportunities for individual and stakeholding group input into the process eliminated the need for these groups to engage in lobbying tactics or coalition building, but rather it nurtured a type of working relationship with the government. Additionally, the government attempted to make Albertans aware of the various ways that they could express their opinions. For example, a questionnaire was distributed and Albertans were encouraged to respond to it. While the designers of the questionnaire had good intentions, few Albertans responded. This can be attributed to a number of factors. In attempting to make the questionnaire appealing to the layman the format was perhaps too commonplace, and easily mistaken for an advertisment. Secondly, it was too lengthy, and perhaps attempted to accomplish too many objectives in one document. Finally, Albertans in the past have seldom been given the opportunity to exercise their political rights in such a direct manner. Usually it has been exercised by voting in elections. Thus, it is apparent that further research should be devoted to determining better ways of involving citizens in the policy formulation process.

The appointment of a Minister's Advisory Committee served a number of objectives in the policy formulation process. First, the Advisory Committee was instrumental in creating a concrete document with eighty-eight recommendatiuons for the future direction of secondary education in Alberta. This document, based on the views, preferences, and expectations expressed by the public, as well as those contained in commissioned academic reports and studies related to secondary education, provided the basis for discussion on the changes and direction necessary in Secondary Education. This very process might be viewed as a way of expanding the zone of tolerance of Albertans with regard to changes in secondary education, although further research is necessary to confirm this. However,

perhaps through the thorough discussion of the recommendations made by the Minister's Advisory Committee (as was the case with the Alberta School Trustees' Association and the Conference of Alberta School Superintedents) individuals could attain a better understanding of the issues and of the policy decisions necessary to address those issues. At any rate, the Minister's Advisory Committee generated much discussion and debate across the province of Alberta and among parents, educators and members of the community concerning secondary education now and in the future.

There is a need, however, to re-evaluate the appointment of an Advisory Committee for future policymakng situations. For example, the Minister's Advisory Committee might be viewed as a quasi-poltical committee, because it was appointed by the Minister of Education, and chaired by a Member of the Legislative Assembly. The appointment of a political figure, elected to represent the views and needs of Albertans, may be viewed as a way to demonstrate to Albertans that their MLA represents yet another channel by which they can influence policy decisions. There is a potential danger in appointing an MLA to the position of chairman of an "Advisory" Committee particularily when the function of the Committee was merely to hear what Albertans had to say and to make recommendations that may or may not be acted upon in the final policy document. In the case of the formulation of Secondary Education Policy, the recommendations in the report "Foundations for the Future" were revised following public response. However, the revised document was never made public, thus the direct relationship between the Minister's Advisory Committee's recommendations and the content of the final policy document is not common knownledge.

Secondly, the question must be asked, what if the recommendations made in the Minister's Advisory Committee's report did not reflect the views and needs of the majority of Albertans, what recourse do they have? In other words, if an elected representative is perceived to not be representing the views of the people, there is no immediate political

recourse to having their needs and demands met. However, if the Advisory Committee for example had been chaired by a civil servant or an academic from a University, then if Albertans disagreed with their recommendations they then could turn to such politcal channels as their MLA, or the Minister of Education,or to bureaucratic channels such as the Deputy Minister of Education. While it is not the purpose of this study to resolve such a dilemma, it is important that these factors be carefully considered in future policymaking situations.

Finally, in adopting a consultative approach to policy formulation, further discussion, research, and consideration should be devoted to the concept of a partnership approach to policymaking. First, given the present legislative mechanism for policymaking in Alberta, it is apparent that politicians ultimately determine what is in the best interests of society. In making these decisions politicians must rely upon senior level government officials, who determine which policy recommendations are the most feasible. These policy recommendations must then be accepted by a group of elected representatives who determine if the policy will be acceptable within the value framework of society. Thus, the likelihood of a more than incremental change occuring as the result of a new policy may be delimited by society's understanding of the issues that the policy addresses. Therefore, further research is necessary to determine if the consultative approach to policy formulation does in fact enhance society's understanding and acceptance of policy decisions, and whether or not it affects their zone of tolerance for change.

In conclusion, the process adopted by Alberta Education in the Formulation of the Secondary Education Policy, deserves further investigation, especially in such areas as stakeholder participation, and on the affects of using a consultative approach to enhance the acceptance and implementation of that public policy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alberta Education
1984 "Alberta secondary education review: research basis."Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Education.

Alberta Education
1984 "Alberta's secondary education program: the public's view." Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Education.

Alberta Education
1984 "Secondary education programs review questionnaire." Edmonton, Alberta: Alberta Education.

Alberta School Trustees' Association
1985 "New directions for secondary education in alberta." Edmonton, Alberta: ASTA.

Alberta Teachers' Association
1985 "Comments on review of secondary programs reoprt of the minister's advisory committee." Edmonton, Alberta: ATA.

Alberta Teachers' Asscoiation
1984 "Submission on secondary school program Edmonton, Alberta: ATA.

Alberta Teachers' Association
1984 "Supplementary submission to the minster's advisory on secondary education review." Edmonton, Alberta: ATA.

Allison, Derek
1983 "Policy and the practice of educational administration."The Canadian Administrator XXIII (October).

Almond, G.A., and J.B. Powell
1966 Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach. Toronto: Little Brown and Co.

Amara, Roy C.
1972 "Toward a framework for national goals and policy research." Policy Sciences 3: 59-69.

Ary, D., L. C. Jacobs, and A. Razavieh
1979 Introduction to Research in Education (Second Edition). New York: Holt, Rinehardt and Winston.

Baldridge, J. Victor
1971 Power and Conflict in the University. London: John Wiley and Sons Inc.

Bauer, R. A., and K. J. Gergen
1968 The Study of Policy Formation. New York: The Free Press.

Berman, P
1978 "The study of macro- and micro-implementation." Public Policy 26 (2):157-84.

Berman, P. and M. McLaughlin
1976 "Implementation of educational innovation." Educational Forum 40 (3): 345-70.

Bogdan, R. C., and S. K. Biklen
1982 Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Borg, W. R., and M. D. Gall
1983 Educational Research: An Introduction (fourth edition). New York: Longman.

Bosetti, R. A.
1973 "A systems framework for integrating planning and policymaking." Unpublished paper University of Alberta, 1973.

Butt, Richard
1984 "Pioneering the future: educational implications and policy directions for alberta secondary schools." Universtiy of Lethbridge, July 1984.

Canadian Gallup Poll Ltd.
1984 "Gallup summary report." Prepared for Alberta Education by Canadian Gallup Poll Ltd., 1984.

Calgary Catholic School Board
1984 "A brief in response to alberta education secondary programs review questionnaire." Calgary, Alberta.

Calgary Catholic School Board
1984 "A response to foundations to the future secondary school review." Calgary, Alberta.

Cameron, Kim, S.
1984 "Organizational adaptation and higher education." Journal of Higher Education 55 (2): 122-144.

Calvin Christian School
1985 "Response to foundations for the future." Monarch, Alberta.

Christian Schools International
1985 "Response to the minister's advisory committee for review of secondary programs." Edmonton, Alberta.

Conference of Alberta School Superintendents
1985 ""Conference of alberta school superintendents' reaction to review of secondry programs:foundations for the future." Edmonton, Alberta: CASS.

Digout, Stanislaus, L.
1969 "Public aid for private schools in Alberta: the making of a decision." University of Alberta, Unpublished master's thesis.

Dror, Yehezkel
1971 Design for Policy Sciences. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company, Inc.

Dror, Yehezkel
1968 Public Policymaking Re-examined. Scranton, Pa.: Chandler.

Dunn, William N.
1981 Public Policy Analysis: An Introduction.Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Dye, Thomas
1981 Understanding Public Policy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Elmore, R.
1979 "Backward mapping: implementation research and policy decision."Political Science Quarterly 1979-80 94: 601-16.

Fairchild, H. P.
1962 Dictionary of Sociology. New York: Philosophical Library Publishers.

Fischer, Frank
1980 Politics, Values, and Public Policy: The Problem of Methodology. Colorado: Westview Press.

Fleishman, Joel, Lance Liebman, and Mark Moore
1981 Public Duties: The Moral Obligations of Government Officials. London, England: Harvard Press.

Freeman, R. Edward
1984 Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. Boston: Pitman Publishing Company.

Fullan, M.
1982 The Meaning of Educational Change. The Onatrio Institute for Studies in Education: OISE Press.

Gee, William
1950 Social Science Research Methods. New York: Appelton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Gergen, K. J.
1968a "Assessing the leverage points in the process of policy formation." In R. A. Bauer and K. J. Gergen, The Study of Policy Formation. New York: The Free Press.

Gergen, K. J.
1968b "Methodology in the study of policy formation." In R. A. Bauer and K. J. Gergen, The Study of Policy Formation. New York: The Free Press.

Gorden, Raymond
1975 Interviewing:Strategies,Techniques and Tatics. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press.

Government of Alberta
1985 "Secondary education in alberta: policy statement." Government of Alberta June 1985.

Kimbrough, R. B.
1964 Political Power and Educational Decision-Making. Chicago: Rand-McNally and Company.

Kerlinger, Fred
1973Foundations of Behavioral Research (second edition). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Lamoureux, P.
1985 "Secondary education in Alberta: policy statement." Unpublished document Alberta Education October 1985.

Lasswell, Harold D.
1971 A Pre-View of Policy Sciences. New York: American Elsevier.

Lawson, R. F., and Barbara Stevenson
1984 "Comparative studies project." University of Calgary, June 1984.

Lindblom, Charles, E.
1968 The Policy-Making Process. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Lloyd. Michael
1984 "Secondary education programs review: summary of policy recommendations and issues identified in briefs and from groups/organizations." University of Alberta, July 1984.

McEwen, Nelly
1984 "The response of albertans to the secondary program review questionnaire." Alberta Education: Planning and Evaluation Division, June 1984.

Minister's Advisory Committee
1984Report of the minister's advisory committee: foundations for the future." Government of Alberta Edmonton, 1984.

Mitchell, John, J.
1984 "The alberta secondary student: some general growth profiles." University of Alberta, June 1984.

Morgan, Gareth
1986 Images of Organization. London: Sage Publications.

Premier Peter Lougheed
1985 "New directions for the secondary education, curriculum and programs." Statement by Premier Lougheed, June 12, 1985.

Purkey, S. and M. Smith
1985 "School reform: the district policy implications of the effective schools literature." The Elementary School Journal 85 (3).

Sayeed, Khalid, B.
1973 "Public policy analysis in Washington and Ottawa." Policy Sciences 4: 85-101.

Sheehan, Nancy, M.
1984 "Educational developments, societal conditions and the secondary school curriculum in alberta: an historical overview." University of Calgary, June 1984.

Smith, Thomas B.
1973 "The implementation process." Policy Sciences 4:197-209.

Stringham, B. L.
1974 "The school act 1970: A case study of public policy making in education." University of Alberta, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.

Tolman, L.R.
1984 "Opinions of secondary school students regarding objectives of secondary education in alberta." Alberta education, June, 1984.

Tymko, J. L.
1979 "A case study of public policy implementation." University of Alberta, unpublished Ph.D dissertation.

Vanderhoek, John
1984 Letter to David King, Minister of Education, 27 March 1984.

Wildavsky, Aaron
1979 Speaking Truth to Power. New York: Wiley.

Weiss, Carol, H.
1982 "Policy research in the context of diffuse decision-making." In D. B. Kallen, G. B. Kosse, H. C. Wagenaar, J. J. Kloprogge, and M. Vorkbeck. Social Science Research and Public Policy-Making: A Reapraisal. United Kingdom: NFER-Nelson, Borks.

Worth, Walter
1986 "Learning to plan for learning." Opening Address of the Annual Joint Conference to Alberta School Superintendents and Alberta Education, April 23, 1986.

Yates, Douglas T. Jr.
1981 "Hard choices: Justifying bureaucratic decisions." In J. Fleishman, L. Liebman, and M. Moore. Public Duties: The Moral Obligations of Government Officials. London, England: Harvard Press.

APPENDIX A

CHRONOLOGY

CHRONOLOGY OF THE POLICY FORMULATION PROCESS

ASSESSING THE NEED FOR CHANGE	a) The Deputy Minister and his department began to ask people who might know about the need for change in the system. ie: MLA's Superintendents, Principals, Teachers, Parents, Students, and Key Members of the stakeholder groups. b) Reviewing the current literature dealing with educational change, and effective schools. c) Examining Secondary Education reviews that were occuring in other parts of Canada,the United States, and Europe. d) Reviewing annual reports and submissions from major stakeholder groups. e) General discussion in both political and educational circles since 1975.
GENERAL OR SPECIFIC ISSUES THAT PROMTED THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE SECONDARY EDUCATION SYSTEM	a) Public perception: a perceived expression of discontent and a perceived lack of confidence in the present educational system. b) Future orientation: in a rapidly changing world requires an educational system organized to prepare students to become contributing citizens in the 21st century. c) Comprehensive review: since the 1970's the system has gone through numerous piecemeal changes. It was time for a comprehensive review of the secondary education system. d) Results orientation: in the past the educational system was process orientated. In today's competitive world there needs to be more emphasis on the quality of the output, and on accountablity for output. e) Cooperative outlook: the educational community was marked by contraversy and a

confrontational attitude. The review was an opportunity to bring the educational community back together again in a cooperative effort to improve secondary education.

f) Reliable structure: to accomany a movement toward accountability and output, there must be reliable structure in place in which all participants know and understand how and why it works, and are cognizant of its established guidelines andboundaries. Thus, if one chooses to step beyond these boundaries he is doing it consciously and is willing to accept responsibility for the consquences of his actions.

THE MINISTER AND THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF EDUCATION DETERMINE STRATEGY FROM WHICH TO CONDUCT THE REVIEW	Determine the goals and objectives of the review.
ESTABLISH A 12 MEMBER ALBERTA EDUCATION PROJECT TEAM	Team was responsible for the collection and analysis of thepublic opinion surveys, summmarizing pertinent literature, and managing the research projects that were relevant to the review.
THE APPOINTMENT BY THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION OF A MINISTER'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE	The Minister's Advisory committee was appointedto be an extensions of the eyes and ears of the Minister. The committee was charged with the responsilbility of conducting the review, assessing the information aquired through the review process, to prepare a report based on their findings, and ultimately, to advise the Minister. Secondly, the Advisory Committee was formed with an MLA as the chiarperson in order to demonstrate to the public the political dimension and involvement in policymaking. It was an opportunity for the public to become actively involved in the process and to see and hear the political component in action.

OFFICIAL ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION ON FEBRUARY 1984, OF A REVIEW OF THE SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAM

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH THERE IS A DISCREPANCY BETWEEN WHAT ALBERTANS PERCEIVE THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM TO BE LIKE AND WHAT THEY THINK IT SHOULD BE LIKE

a) An information brochure describing the current secondary education program in Alberta and an accompanying questionnaire was distributed to households across Alberta. The purpose of this package was to give Albertans an opportunity to learn about and to understand the secondary education in Alberta, given this information base, to then express their views and expectations as to what the program should be by filling out the questionnaire provided.

b) Gallup Poll was commissionedby Alberta Education. The purpose of the poll was to obtain a representative sample reflecting the views and expectations of Albertans with regard to the present educational system.

c) An opinionnaire was conducted using a stratified random sample of students in grades 10 and 12. The purpose of the opinionnaire was to seek the opinion of students with regard to what they perceive to be the objectives which a good secondary school should seek to achieve. The opinionnaire was similar to one used in a similar survey conducted in 1973. Thus, Alberta Education was able to obtain an indication of the changing attitudes of secondary students over the past eleven years.

d) Public forums, debates and information sessions were conducted by the Minister's Advisory Committee, and Alberta Education. As well they attended meetings arranged by various stakeholding groups to discuss the participant's views and expectations with regard to the secondary educational system.

e) Alberta Education commissioned a number of academic reports that might provide guidance in the shaping of the future of Alberta's secondary education system.

JANUARY 1985, THE RELEASE OF THREE DOCUMENTS SUMMARIZING THE REVIEWS OF THE SECONDARY PROGRAMS	The purpose of these three documents was to summarize the results of the discussions, deliberations, and analysis of the information collected thus far in the review process. The documents included "Foundations for the Future" written by the Minister's Advisory Committee; "Alberta's Secondary Education Program : The Public's View"; and "Alberta Secondary Education Review: Reserach Bases."
ALBERTAN'S WERE INVITED TO RESPOND TO THE 88 RECOMMENDATIONS MADE IN THE REPORT WRITTEN BY THE MINISTER'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE: "FOUNDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE"	
FINAL ANALYSIS OF THE SUBMISSIONS AND BRIEFS RECEIVED FROM INDIVIDUALS AND STAKEHOLDING GROUPS IN REACTION TO "FOUNDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE"	Based on the information attained during this round of consultation the Minister's Advisory Committee revised "Foundations for the Future" and submitted this revised report to the Minister in an unpublished document.
THE WRITING OF THE FINAL POLICY STATEMENT	a) Essentially three groups provided a possible draft of the final policy document: Dr.P.Lamoureux, on behalf of the Project Team; Dr.G.Bevan, director of curriculum for Alberta Education; the Minister's Advisory Committee, (in the revised form of the report "Foundations for the Future".) b) The final policy document was then created in the office of the Deputy Minister of Education. c) The document was then sent to the Minister and his Advisory Committee for comments and revisions, then to the Educational Caucus Committee, and finally to Caucus for final approval.

OFFICIAL ANNOUNCEMENT BY PREMIER LOUGNEED AND HON. DAVID KING OF THE FINAL POLICY STATEMENT: SECONDARY EDUCATION IN ALBERTA, ON JUNE 12, 1985

Announcement made by teleconference where Mr.King and Premier Lougheed interacted with the media in Lethbridge Calgary, Medicine Hat, Red Deer, Grand Praire, Fort McMurray, Lloydminister, and two Edmonton locations.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Mr.David King, former Minister of Education, August,1986

Dr. Rino Bosetti, Deputy Minister of Education, November,1985
June,1986

Dr. Phillip Lamoureux, Coordinator of Alberta Education Project Team, October,1985; November,1985; June,1986

Mr.Halvar Jonson, Chairman of the Minister's Advisory Committee, July, 1986

Dr. Lawrence Tymko, Acting Executive Director of the ASTA, August.1986

Dr. Bernie Keeler, Executive Secretary of the ATA, August 13,1986

Mrs. Jackie Gee, Chairperson of Education Committee for Conference of Alberta School Superintendents, August 13, 1986

Mr. Gary Duthler, Executive Secretary of the Association for Christian Independent Schools International, August 26, 1986

Mr. Bill Koole, Assistant Principal and Curriculam Cooridinator for Edmonton Christian High School, August 26, 1986

Mr. Ary DeMoor, Curriculum Cooridinator for Edmonton Christian Schools, August 26, 1986

Dr. J. Kevin McKinney, Executive Director of the ACSTA, September 2, 1986

Mr. Rick Laplante, Cooridinator for Religious Education, ACSTA,
September 2, 1986

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

MINISTER'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. What specific or general issues created the need for or prompted the Secondary Education Review?

2. Why was an advisory committee formed and what was its role?

3. On what basis were the advisory committee members selected?

4. The Secondary Education process appears to have been clearly articulated at the outset of the review, to what extent was your committee involved in determing or altering the process?

5. Did the committee expect to write the final policy?

6. The Minister's Advisory Committee began its consultation process by publishing and asking for responses to "Foundations for the Future". How did the committee decide what to include in the discussion paper. (Questionnaire, Gallup Poll, Responses etc. or other?)

7. The committee held many hearings across the Province. How did it aggreate and present the views expressed to them?

8. Did the views of members of your committee change? How?

9. Was your committee consulted or did it prepare the final draft of the policy? (What was the extent of the consultation?)

10. The committee appears to have reached some conclusions although it is not really clear as to the extent to which the final policy reflects the views of the committee, nor is there much evidence of the views of the committee with respect to the representations made to them. Did the final policy represent the views of the committee and did it take adequate account of the submissions, representations etc made to your committee?

11. Who were the most influential actors in the process and in shaping the final policy?

12. Do you feel that the consultative process employed was adequate? How might it have been improved?

13. There are some critics who say that the consultative process was a facade, that Albertans were provided an opportunity to respond to "Foundations for the Future" while the policy was already "hatched". Should the consultative process have been extended to a review of the proposed policy- or is the policy sufficiently broad to allow interest groups and Albertans to influence the degree of discretion which is allowed in policy implementation?

14. In your political role, do you feel that you have a good sense of public educational values? Do you feel that the policy falls well within the zone of public acceptability?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS: MINISTER OF EDUCATION

1. What specific of general issues created the need for or prompted the Secondary Education Review?

   1. Public perception
   2. Future orientation
   3. comprhensive
   4. results orientation
   5. Desire to encourage cooperation
   6. reliable structure

2. How did you identify the issues in which the review would deal with?

3. Did the Department have a vision or master plan at the outset of the review?

4. What did you hope to achieve through the initiation of the review?

5. Why was an Advisory Committee formed and what was its role?

6. On what basis were the Advisory Committee member's selected?

7. Did you expect the committee to write the final policy?

8. Why were the 88 recommendations proposed in the document "Foundations for the Future" used as the basis for the second round of consultation?

9. Do you feel that the consulatative process employed was adequate? How might it have been improved?

10. There are some critics who say that the consultative process was a facade, that Albertan were provided an opportunity to respond to "Foundations for the Future," while the policy was already hatched. Should the consulative process have been extended to a review of the proposed policy-or is the policy sufficiently broad to allow interest groups and Albertans to influence the degree of discretion which is allowed in polciy implementation?

11. What were the circumstances and the political processes that led to the government's decision to endorse the Secondary Education Review? The policy development process?

12. Who were the most influential actors in the process and in shaping the the final policy?

13. In your political role, do you feel that you have a good sense of public education values? Do you feel that the policy falls well within the zone of public acceptability?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

ASSOCIATIONS

1. What specific or general issues created the need for or prompted the Secondary Program Review?

2. What did you hope to achieve through becoming involved in the review?

3. Did you solicit the views and expectations of your members?

4. How did you involve your members in articulating your association's views?

5. Did you decide to employ a specific strategy to influence the outcomes of the review?

6. To whom did you present your views?
   -In what format?
   -How often?
   -To what extent?

7. Alberta Education contends that it has employed an extensive consultative process and has provided all Albertans an opportunity for meaningful involvement. Did your assoctation have adequate opportunities to influence the direction and outcome of the Secondary Education Review?

8. Do you feel that the final policy adequately represents or addresses the views of your organization?

9. Given that educational policy is public policy of significance to every Albertan, do you feel that too much emphasis was placed upon public as opposed to professional input?

10. Which political actors do you feel were most influential in the process?

WHAT IS THE EXACT POSITION YOU HOLD WITH THE ASSOCIATION?

HOW WAS THE COMMITTEE FORMED?

IS THERE A COMPLETE LIST OF THOSE MEMBERS AVAILABLE?

APPENDIX C

CORRESPONDENCE

CORRESPONDENCE

The following letter was sent to the key actors interviewed in the study inorder to reconfirm the accuracy and validity of their association's postion with regard to the formulation of the Secondary Education Policy as articulated in the study. Thus the following people were contacted:

Mrs. J. Gee (CASS)
MR. G. Duthlier (AISCA)
Dr. L. Tymko (ASTA)
Dr. B. Keeler (ATA)
Dr. R. Bosetti
Mr. D. King

55 Bellevue Crescent
St. Albert, Alberta
T8N 0A5
September 4, 1986

Dear Mrs. Jackie Gee,

I would like to once again thank you for our interview session earlier this month. The information I attained from the session was most insightful. I have now completed, in draft form, an account of your Association's involvement in the formulation of the "Alberta Secondary Education Policy". I have enclosed for your approval a copy of this portion of my thesis. I would sincerely appreciate any comments, revisions, or other forms of input that you might offer, as it would enhance the validity and the accuracy of my thesis.

I must apologize for any inconvience this request may cause you, as it is a busy time of the year, however, if at all possible I would appreciate your response by September 29, 1986.

Thank you for your time in dealing with this matter.

Sincerely,

Lynn Bosetti